arXiv:1207.0723v2 [math-ph] 4 Jul 2012

A non-symmetric Yang-Baxter Algebra for the Quantum Nonlinear Schrödinger Model

Bart Vlaar*
Korteweg de Vries Institute for Mathematics
University of Amsterdam, Netherlands

July 6, 2012

Abstract

We study certain non-symmetric wavefunctions associated to the quantum nonlinear Schrödinger model, introduced by Komori and Hikami using Gutkin's propagation operator, which involves representations of the degenerate affine Hecke algebra. We highlight how these functions can be generated using a vertex-type operator formalism similar to the recursion defining the symmetric (Bethe) wavefunction in the quantum inverse scattering method. Furthermore, some of the commutation relations encoded in the Yang-Baxter equation for the relevant monodromy matrix are generalized to the non-symmetric case.

1 Introduction

The quantum nonlinear Schrödinger (QNLS) or Lieb-Liniger model describes a system of N spinless (in particular, bosonic) particles restricted to a circle or an infinite line with pairwise contact interaction whose strength is determined by a constant $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$; most of the theory deals with the repulsive case ($\gamma > 0$). It was introduced in 1963 [26] and has been studied extensively since, e.g. [5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 24, 39, 46]. Nevertheless the QNLS model still has open questions attached to it, and dealing with these issues is all the more important since the QNLS model is in many ways a prototypical integrable model; it was introduced [26] as the first example of a parameter-dependent boson gas for which eigenstates and eigenvalues of the quantum Hamiltonian can be calculated exactly. Earlier, Girardeau [14] studied a related system which does not contain a (nontrivial) parameter but which can be obtained from the QNLS model in the limit $\gamma \to \infty$. Furthermore, there has been experimental interest; the low energy eigenstates of a certain gas of three-dimensional particles in a long cylinder are described by the QNLS model [27, 36] and such systems have been manufactured [42, 43] by magnetically trapping and cooling rubidium-85 atoms.

Write $\boldsymbol{e}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{e}_N$ for the standard Euclidean basis of $\mathbb{R}^N$, and assume the particle coordinates are given by $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_N) \in J^N$ with $J = [x_-, x_+] \subset \mathbb{R}$. Write $\partial_j = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$ and $\Delta = p_2(\boldsymbol{\nabla}) = \sum_{j=1}^N \partial_j^2$, where p_2 denotes the sum-of-squares polynomial. In convenient units, the Hamiltonian for the QNLS model is formally given by

$$H_\gamma = -\Delta + 2\gamma \sum_{j<k} \delta(x_j - x_k),$$

and its eigenfunctions will be referred to as *(QNLS) wavefunctions*. The eigenvalue problem for H_γ can be made rigorous [26] by replacing it with a Helmholtz equation and imposing certain jump conditions on the derivatives of the candidate functions.

---

*E-mail: B.H.M.Vlaar@uva.nl

We note that a physically acceptable wavefunction Ψ describing a bosonic system must be symmetric: $\Psi(x_1,\dots,x_N) = \Psi(x_{w1},\dots,x_{wN})$ for all $w \in S_N$. Notwithstanding this, we will consider the non-symmetric[1] eigenfunctions ψ of the QNLS Hamiltonian, brought into the theoretical picture of the QNLS model by Komori and Hikami [21, 23] by means of Gutkin's *propagation operator* [8, 15], which intertwines two representations of the A-type *degenerate affine Hecke algebra* (dAHA) [8, 15, 19], in analogy to the non-symmetric Jack polynomials in the Calogero-Sutherland-Moser model [2, 20, 34]. From the non-symmetric wavefunctions the symmetric ones are obtained by symmetrization: $\Psi(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{1}{N!}\sum_{w\in S_N} \psi(x_{w1},\dots,x_{wN})$. Our main result is a recursive formula generating the non-symmetric wavefunctions with vertex-type operators, akin to the formula recursively defining the *symmetric* (Bethe) wavefunction in the quantum inverse scattering method [17, 25, 37], thus closely tying this method to the Hecke algebra approach.

1.1 Outline

We will recall how to treat the QNLS Hamiltonian eigenvalue problem more rigorously in Sect. 2. We will also discuss the history of the solution methods of the QNLS model, in particular we will review Lieb and Liniger's solution and briefly discuss the quantum inverse scattering method (QISM) for the QNLS model. In Sect. 3 of the present paper we will discuss aspects of the dAHA approach for the pertinent case (A_{N-1}-type) in more detail. In particular, this is where we will review the theory of the *propagation operator* and the *non-symmetric eigenfunctions* $\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ alluded to earlier. In Sect. 4 we will define the *non-symmetric creation operators* $b^{\pm}_{\mu}$ that can be used to generate the $\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ recursively, by virtue of convenient commutation relations with the propagation operator. In Sect. 5 we will define operators $a^{\pm}_{\mu}, c^{\pm}_{\mu}$ that together with $b^{\pm}_{\mu}$ satisfy certain commutation relations, at least for the case of the QNLS problem on the circle. Finally, in Sect. 6 we will make the connection between the "non-symmetric" operators $a^{\pm}_{\mu}, b^{\pm}_{\mu}, c^{\pm}_{\mu}$ and their established "symmetric" equivalents, the operators A_μ, B_μ, C_μ, D_μ from the QISM for the QNLS model. Some well-known commutation relations of these symmetric operators are recovered.

Acknowledgements

This paper is based on the author's PhD thesis [44] supervised by Christian Korff at the University of Glasgow, undertaken with financial support from the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council. This work was partially supported by a free competition grant of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO). The author would like to thank Christian Korff and Jasper Stokman for useful discussions.

2 Rigorous definition of the QNLS model and solution methods

Throughout this paper we will let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $J = [x_-, x_+] \subset \mathbb{R}$ be fixed but arbitrary. Note that the interval J may be unbounded and equal to $\mathbb{R}$; if it is bounded we will always assume that $L = x_+ - x_-$.

2.1 Hyperplanes and derivative jump conditions

To place H_γ on a more rigorous footing, consider the standard A_{N-1} hyperplane arrangement

$$\left\{ V_{j\,k} := (\boldsymbol{e}_j - \boldsymbol{e}_k)^\perp = \left\{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N \,\middle|\, x_j = x_k \right\} \right\}_{1\leq j<k\leq N}$$

---

[1] Where suitable we will denote non-symmetric objects by lowercase letters and their symmetric counterparts by the corresponding capital letters.

and[2] the associated set of *regular vectors*

$$\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}} := \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \bigcup_{1 \le j,k \le N} V_{j\,k} = \left\{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N \,\middle|\, x_j \neq x_k \text{ if } j \neq k \right\}.$$

S_N is the Weyl group associated to the collection of hyperplanes $V_{j\,k}$ in the following way. Given $1 \le j \neq k \le N$, write $s_{j\,k}$ for the transposition swapping j and k, and for $j = 1, \ldots, N-1$ write $s_j := s_{j\,j+1}$. Then the orthogonal reflection in the hyperplane $V_{j\,k}$ is given by

$$s_{j\,k}(x_1, \ldots, x_N) = (x_1, \ldots, \underset{(j)}{x_k}, \ldots, \underset{(k)}{x_j}, \ldots, x_N),$$

which can be extended to a left action of S_N on $\mathbb{R}^N$. $\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}}$ is an invariant subset and this action carries over to the set of its connected components, the *alcoves*. In fact, we have

$$\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}} = \bigcup_{w \in S_N} w\mathbb{R}^N_+, \qquad \mathbb{R}^N_+ = \left\{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N \,\middle|\, x_1 > \ldots > x_N \right\}. \tag{2.1}$$

Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. We use the standard notations $\mathcal{F}(U), \mathcal{C}(U), \mathcal{C}^k(U)$ for the vector spaces of functions, continuous functions and, for $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 1} \cup \{\infty\}$ and open U, r-times continuously differentiable functions: $U \to \mathbb{C}$, respectively. If U is itself an S_N-invariant set such as $\mathbb{R}^N$ or $\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}}$ these are left S_N-modules through $(wf)(\boldsymbol{x}) = f(w^{-1}\boldsymbol{x})$. Furthermore, the following S_N-submodules of $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ have been introduced [8, 15]:

$$\mathcal{CB}^1(\mathbb{R}^N) = \left\{ f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^N) \,\middle|\, \forall w\, f|_{w\mathbb{R}^N_+} \text{ has a } \mathcal{C}^1\text{-extension to an open neighbourhood of } \overline{w\mathbb{R}^N_+} \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) = \left\{ f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^N) \,\middle|\, \forall w\, f|_{w\mathbb{R}^N_+} \text{ is smooth} \right\}.$$

Given $1 \le j < k \le N$, call $\boldsymbol{x} \in V_{j\,k}$ *subregular* if $\boldsymbol{x}$ is not on any other hyperplane. For subregular $\boldsymbol{x} \in V_{j\,k}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, $\boldsymbol{x}_{\pm\epsilon} := \boldsymbol{x} \pm \epsilon(\boldsymbol{e}_j - \boldsymbol{e}_k)$ is in an alcove, $w^{-1}\mathbb{R}^N$ say, the walls of which are subsets with nonempty interior of the hyperplanes $V_{w^{-1}(r)\,w^{-1}(r+1)}$ where $r = 1, \ldots, N-1$. Hence $w(j) = r$ and $w(k) = r+1$ for some $r = 1, \ldots, N-1$. We now recall the following key result.

Proposition 2.1. *[8, Prop. 2.2] Let $f \in \mathcal{CB}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $\gamma, E \in \mathbb{R}$. Then f is an eigenfunction of H_γ with eigenvalue E precisely if f satisfies*

$$-\Delta f|_{\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}}} = E f|_{\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}}} \tag{2.2}$$

and the derivative jump conditions

$$\lim_{\substack{\epsilon \to 0 \\ \epsilon > 0}} \Big((\partial_j - \partial_k) f(\boldsymbol{x}_\epsilon) - (\partial_j - \partial_k) f(\boldsymbol{x}_{-\epsilon}) \Big) = 2\gamma f(\boldsymbol{x}), \tag{2.3}$$

for $1 \le j < k \le N$ and $\boldsymbol{x} \in V_{j\,k}$ subregular. A priori, (2.2) *is interpreted distributionally; however, if f also satisfies* (2.3) *then $f \in \mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$.*

For f to describe a system of particles on a circle of circumference L, say, then the finite hyperplane arrangement $\{V_{j\,k}\}_{1 \le j < k \le N}$ needs to be replaced by the affine hyperplane arrangement

$$\left\{ V_{j\,k;m} := \left\{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N \,\middle|\, x_j - x_k = mL \right\} \right\}_{1 \le j < k \le N,\, m \in \mathbb{Z}}.$$

---

[2] The vectors $\boldsymbol{e}_j - \boldsymbol{e}_k$, $1 \le j < k \le N$, realize a positive system of a finite root system of type A_{N-1}, spanning the subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$ of vectors whose coordinates sum to zero (corresponding to studying the N-particle system in the centre-of-mass frame). It is a peculiarity of the type A root systems that their natural realizations do not span the whole coordinate space. In this paper, we will work with Weyl group actions on the whole $\mathbb{R}^N$.

A key role is played by the affine Weyl group $\hat{S}_N = \langle s_0, \ldots, s_N \rangle$, where the affine simple reflection s_0 acts as $s_0(\boldsymbol{x}) = (x_N + L, x_2, \ldots, x_{N-1}, x_1 - L)$. Furthermore, f is required to be L-periodic in each variable. We refer to [7, 8] for more detail. We will follow an alternative approach [26], where we take a solution f of the QNLS problem on $\mathbb{R}^N$, i.e. satisfying (2.2-2.3), consider its restriction to a hypercube J^N, where $J = [x_-, x_+]$ with $x_+ - x_- = L$, and impose

$$\begin{aligned} f(\boldsymbol{x})|_{x_j=x_-} &= f(\boldsymbol{x})|_{x_j=x_+}, \\ \lim_{x_j \to x_-} \partial_j f(\boldsymbol{x}) &= \lim_{x_j \to x_+} \partial_j f(\boldsymbol{x}), \end{aligned} \qquad \text{for } j = 1, \ldots, N. \tag{2.4}$$

2.2 The Bethe ansatz

Lieb and Liniger [26] solved the QNLS problem (both on the line and the circle) by modifying Bethe's approach for analysing the one-dimensional Heisenberg model [3], now known as the *(coordinate) Bethe ansatz* (BA). Write $\mathrm{i} = \sqrt{-1}$ and $\langle \boldsymbol{w}, \boldsymbol{z} \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^N w_j \bar{z}_j$ for the Euclidean complex inner product on $\mathbb{C}^N$. Consider the *plane wave* $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with wavevector $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_N) \in \mathbb{C}^N$ defined by $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{x} \rangle}$. The BA results in

Proposition 2.2. *[26] The function* $\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \in \mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)^{S_N}$ *defined by*

$$\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}|_{\mathbb{R}^N_+} = \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{w \in S_N} G_\gamma(w\boldsymbol{\lambda})\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(w\boldsymbol{\lambda})} \tag{2.5}$$

satisfies (2.2-2.3) with $E = p_2(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ *precisely if* $G_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \prod_{j<k} \frac{\lambda_j - \lambda_k - \mathrm{i}\gamma}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k}$. *If in addition the* λ_j *are distinct and satisfy the* Bethe ansatz equations *(BAEs), viz.*

$$\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\lambda_j L} = \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq j}}^N \frac{\lambda_j - \lambda_k + \mathrm{i}\gamma}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k - \mathrm{i}\gamma}, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \ldots, N, \tag{2.6}$$

then $\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}|_{J^N}$ *satisfies* (2.4).

2.3 The quantum inverse scattering method

The *quantum inverse scattering method* (QISM) was developed by the Faddeev school [9, 25, 37, 40, 41] after Baxter's pioneering work on exactly solvable models in statistical mechanics and his method of commuting transfer matrices; see [1] for a textbook account and references therein. It turns out [17, 35, 33] that the QNLS Hamiltonian can be expressed in terms of quantum field operators, certain operator-valued distributions, associated to a non-relativistic quantum field theory (the formalism known in the physics literature as "second quantization"). This corresponding time evolution equation is a quantized version of the classical nonlinear Schrödinger equation, which explains the name of our quantum model. Using the QISM the QNLS model can be solved, as follows.

Consider the standard L^2-inner product $(f, g) = \int_{J^N} \mathrm{d}^N\boldsymbol{x} f(\boldsymbol{x})\overline{g(\boldsymbol{x})}$. S_N acts on the *N-particle sector* $\mathfrak{h}_N = \mathrm{L}^2(J^N)$ by means of $(wf)(\boldsymbol{x}) = f(w^{-1}\boldsymbol{x})$, with $(wf, g) = \big(f, w^{-1}g\big)$ for all $w \in S_N$. $\mathfrak{h}_N$ is a Hilbert space with respect to $(,)$, as are $\mathcal{H}_N = \mathfrak{h}_N^{S_N}$ and $\mathcal{H}$, the *(bosonic) Fock space*, the subset of the direct sum of all $\mathcal{H}_N$ consisting of elements of finite L^2-norm. The QISM revolves around the so-called *monodromy matrix* [17, 25, 37]

$$\mathcal{T}_\mu = \begin{pmatrix} A_\mu & B_\mu \\ C_\mu & D_\mu \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{End}(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{H}),$$

which satisfies the *Yang-Baxter equation* (YBE) related to the Yangian of $\mathfrak{gl}_2$, viz.

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mu-\nu}(\mathcal{T}_\mu \otimes 1)(1 \otimes \mathcal{T}_\nu) = (1 \otimes \mathcal{T}_\nu)(\mathcal{T}_\mu \otimes 1)\mathcal{R}_{\mu-\nu} \in \mathrm{End}(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{H}), \tag{2.7}$$

where the *R-matrix* is a parameter-dependent element of $\mathrm{End}(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2)$. For the QNLS model, for $\mu \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ the R-matrix is given by $\mathcal{R}_\mu = 1 - \frac{\mathrm{i}\gamma}{\mu}\mathcal{P}$, with $\mathcal{P}$ the flip sending $\boldsymbol{v}_1 \otimes \boldsymbol{v}_2$ to $\boldsymbol{v}_2 \otimes \boldsymbol{v}_1$, and the matrix entries $A_\mu, B_\mu, C_\mu, D_\mu$ can be explicitly given as integral operators [17, 25, 37]. For any model with the R-matrix given as above, the YBE (2.7) encodes commutation relations for the operators $A_\mu, B_\mu, C_\mu, D_\mu$:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
[A_\mu, A_\nu] = 0 & [B_\mu, B_\nu] = 0 & [C_\mu, C_\nu] = 0 & [D_\mu, D_\nu] = 0 \\
\hline
\multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\begin{array}{c} [A_\mu, B_\nu] = \frac{-\mathrm{i}\gamma}{\mu-\nu}(B_\mu A_\nu - B_\nu A_\mu) \\ [B_\mu, A_\nu] = \frac{-\mathrm{i}\gamma}{\mu-\nu}(A_\mu B_\nu - A_\nu B_\mu) \end{array}} & \multicolumn{2}{c|}{\begin{array}{c} [A_\mu, C_\nu] = \frac{\mathrm{i}\gamma}{\mu-\nu}(C_\mu A_\nu - C_\nu A_\mu) \\ [C_\mu, A_\nu] = \frac{\mathrm{i}\gamma}{\mu-\nu}(A_\mu C_\nu - A_\nu C_\mu) \end{array}} \\
\hline
\multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\begin{array}{c} [D_\mu, B_\nu] = \frac{\mathrm{i}\gamma}{\mu-\nu}(B_\mu D_\nu - B_\nu D_\mu) \\ [B_\mu, D_\nu] = \frac{\mathrm{i}\gamma}{\mu-\nu}(D_\mu B_\nu - D_\nu B_\mu) \end{array}} & \multicolumn{2}{c|}{\begin{array}{c} [D_\mu, C_\nu] = \frac{-\mathrm{i}\gamma}{\mu-\nu}(C_\mu D_\nu - C_\nu D_\mu) \\ [C_\mu, D_\nu] = \frac{-\mathrm{i}\gamma}{\mu-\nu}(D_\mu C_\nu - D_\nu C_\mu) \end{array}} \\
\hline
\multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\begin{array}{c} [A_\mu, D_\nu] = \frac{-\mathrm{i}\gamma}{\mu-\nu}(B_\mu C_\nu - B_\nu C_\mu) \\ [D_\mu, A_\nu] = \frac{-\mathrm{i}\gamma}{\mu-\nu}(C_\mu B_\nu - C_\nu B_\mu) \end{array}} & \multicolumn{2}{c|}{\begin{array}{c} [B_\mu, C_\nu] = \frac{-\mathrm{i}\gamma}{\mu-\nu}(A_\mu D_\nu - A_\nu D_\mu) \\ [C_\mu, B_\nu] = \frac{-\mathrm{i}\gamma}{\mu-\nu}(D_\mu A_\nu - D_\nu A_\mu) \end{array}} \\
\hline
\end{array} \tag{2.8}$$

The algebra so generated is called the *Yang-Baxter algebra.* The relevance of the monodromy matrix lies in the fact that the *transfer matrices* $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^2}\, \mathcal{T}_\mu = A_\mu + D_\mu$ form a self-adjoint commuting family and are generating functions for the integrals of motion, including the Hamiltonian H_γ [9, 25]. The eigenfunction $\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ can be recursively generated, viz.

$$\Psi_{\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_N} = B_{\lambda_N} \cdots B_{\lambda_1} \Psi_\emptyset, \tag{2.9}$$

where $\Psi_\emptyset = 1 \in \mathcal{H}_0 \cong \mathbb{C}$. In addition, for bounded J, if the BAEs (2.6) hold, $\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ is an eigenfunction of the transfer matrix (and hence of H_γ). This method of constructing Ψ is known as the *algebraic Bethe ansatz* (ABA).

2.4 Root system generalizations and recursive structure

An important contribution by Gaudin [12] was the realization that the BA approach can be modified to solve certain generalizations of the Lieb-Liniger system in terms of classical (crystallographic reduced) root systems, which have been the subject of further study [7, 8, 15, 18, 19]. It has been highlighted by Heckman and Opdam [19] that representations of a certain degeneration of the affine Hecke algebra play an essential role, providing another method for solving the QNLS problem, and in fact one which works for all root systems [8]. We will review the type A case in Sect. 3.

Unfortunately, there exists no generalization of the QISM to arbitrary root systems[3]. On the other hand, the drawback of the dAHA method is the apparent lack of a recursive structure, which we will address in this paper. The results of this paper, in particular of Sect. 4 are an indication of a deep connection between these two solution methods, at least for the type A case. This interplay can be seen as something reminiscent of Schur-Weyl duality; the Yangian of $\mathfrak{gl}_2$, the algebraic object underlying the YBE, is a deformation of the current algebra of $\mathfrak{gl}_2$ and its representation theory should be related to that of the degenerate affine Hecke algebra, which is a deformation of the group algebra of S_N.

3 The degenerate affine Hecke algebra

We review the existing theory of the so-called *Dunkl-type operators* associated to the QNLS model, in particular the study of their eigenfunctions as a means to understanding the QNLS model as started by Komori and Hikami [21, 23]. A running example for the case $N = 2$ is provided in Appendix A.

---

[3] However, the type C analogues, both finite and affine, involving 1 or 2 reflecting boundaries, respectively, may be solved by Sklyanin's *boundary Yang-Baxter equation* formalism [38].

3.1 Dunkl-type operators; degenerate affine Hecke algebra

Given $w \in S_N$, consider the set

$$\Sigma_w = \{\, (j,k) \in \{1,\ldots,N\}^2 \,|\, j<k,\, w(j)>w(k) \,\},$$

which labels those positive roots in the standard realization of the type A_{N-1} root system which are mapped by w to a negative root; hence the length of w is given by $l(w) = |\Sigma_w|$. Writing $w = s_{i_1}\cdots s_{i_l}$ with $l = l(w)$ we have

$$\{\, w s_{j\,k} \,|\, (j,k) \in \Sigma_w \,\} = \{\, s_{i_1}\cdots \hat{s}_{i_m} \cdots s_{i_l} \,|\, m = 1,\ldots,l \,\}, \tag{3.1}$$

where $\hat{s}_{i_m}$ indicates that s_{i_m} is removed from the product. This follows by induction on l and the equivalence of the statements

$$\begin{aligned} l(w_1w_2) &= l(w_1) + l(w_2), \\ \Sigma_{w_1w_2} &= w_2^{-1}\Sigma_{w_1} \cup \Sigma_{w_2}, \\ \forall (j,k) &\in w_2^{-1}\Sigma_{w_1} \,:\, j<k. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

for which see [29, Eqn. (2.2.4)]. For $j = 1,\ldots,N$ we define the auxiliary operator $\Lambda_j \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}}))$ by specifying its action on each alcove:

$$\Lambda_j f|_{w^{-1}\mathbb{R}^N_+} = \sum_{k:(k,j)\in\Sigma_w} (s_{j\,k} f)|_{w^{-1}\mathbb{R}^N_+} - \sum_{k:(j,k)\in\Sigma_w} (s_{j\,k} f)|_{w^{-1}\mathbb{R}^N_+}, \tag{3.3}$$

for $w \in S_N, f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}})$. Note that $(s_{j\,k}f)|_{w^{-1}\mathbb{R}^N_+} = s_{j\,k}(f|_{(ws_{j\,k})^{-1}\mathbb{R}^N_+})$ and for $(j,k) \in \Sigma_w$ we have $l(ws_{j\,k}) < l(w)$ as per (3.1).

Definition 3.1. [21, 30, 32] *Let* $j = 1,\ldots,N$. *The* Dunkl-type operator $\partial_{j,\gamma}$ *is given by*

$$\partial_{j,\gamma} = \partial_j - \gamma\Lambda_j \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}})). \tag{3.4}$$

In particular, we have

$$\partial_{j,\gamma}|_{\mathbb{R}^N_+} = \partial_j. \tag{3.5}$$

It is well-established (see, e.g. [30, 32]) that the simple transpositions s_j $(j = 1,\ldots,N-1)$ and the Dunkl-type operators $\partial_{k,\gamma}$ $(k = 1,\ldots,N)$ satisfy the following relations in $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}}))$:

$$s_j^2 = 1; \tag{3.6}$$

$$s_j s_{j+1} s_j = s_{j+1} s_j s_{j+1}; \tag{3.7}$$

$$s_j s_k = s_k s_j, \qquad \text{for } |j-k|>1; \tag{3.8}$$

$$s_j \partial_{j,\gamma} - \partial_{j+1,\gamma} s_j = \gamma; \tag{3.9}$$

$$s_j \partial_{k,\gamma} = \partial_{k,\gamma} s_j, \qquad \text{for } k \neq j, j+1; \tag{3.10}$$

$$\partial_{j,\gamma}\partial_{k,\gamma} = \partial_{k,\gamma}\partial_{j,\gamma}. \tag{3.11}$$

This implies that $s_1,\ldots,s_{N-1}, -\mathrm{i}\,\partial_{1,\gamma},\ldots,-\mathrm{i}\,\partial_{N,\gamma}$ define a representation (to be referred to as the *Dunkl-type representation*) of the *degenerate affine Hecke algebra* (dAHA), written $\mathfrak{H}^N_\gamma$, as introduced by Drinfel′d [6] and Lusztig and Kazhdan [22, 28]. Note that $\mathfrak{H}^N_\gamma \cong \mathbb{C}S_N \otimes \mathbb{C}[X_1,\ldots,X_N]$ as vector spaces; the algebra multiplication is a γ-deformation of the standard action of S_N on the polynomial algebra, as per (3.9-3.10). The centre of $\mathfrak{H}^N_\gamma$ is given by the symmetric expressions in the generators of its polynomial subalgebra [4, 28, 32]. In particular, for $F \in \mathbb{C}[\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_N]^{S_N}$ and $w \in S_N$ we have $[w, F(\boldsymbol{\nabla}_\gamma)] = 0$, where $\boldsymbol{\nabla}_\gamma = (\partial_{1,\gamma},\ldots,\partial_{N,\gamma})$. Using (3.5) we obtain

$$F(\boldsymbol{\nabla}_\gamma) = F(\boldsymbol{\nabla}) \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}})). \tag{3.12}$$

3.2 Integral-reflection operators; the propagation operator

For $1 \le j \neq k \le N$, consider the integral operator $I_{j\,k} \in \mathrm{End}\big(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^N)\big)$ defined by

$$(I_{j\,k} f)(\boldsymbol{x}) = \int_0^{x_j - x_k} \mathrm{d}y f(\boldsymbol{x} - y(\boldsymbol{e}_j - \boldsymbol{e}_k)) = \int_{x_k}^{x_j} \mathrm{d}y f(x_1, \ldots, \underset{(j)}{x_j + x_k - y}, \ldots, \underset{(k)}{y}, \ldots, x_N)$$

for $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$; we note that $I_{j\,k}$ restricts to an operator on $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$. This operator was introduced as a tool to study the QNLS problem in [15, 18]. Given $1 \le j \neq k \le N$, we have $w I_{j\,k} = I_{w(j)\,w(k)} w$ for $w \in S_N$, $s_{j\,k} I_{j\,k} = I_{k\,j} s_{j\,k} = I_{k\,j} = -I_{j\,k}$ and, for $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^N)$,

$$I_{j\,k} f|_{V_{j\,k}} = 0. \tag{3.13}$$

For $j = 1, \ldots, N-1$, we write $I_j := I_{j\,j+1}$ and introduce the *integral-reflection operator*

$$s_{j,\gamma} := s_j + \gamma I_j \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^N)), \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)).$$

It can be checked [8, 19] that the $s_{j,\gamma}$ $(j = 1, \ldots, N-1)$ and $-\mathrm{i}\,\partial_k$ $(k = 1, \ldots, N)$ define a representation, to be referred to as the *integral representation*, of the dAHA on $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N))$, i.e. we may replace $(s_j, \partial_{k,\gamma}) \mapsto (s_{j,\gamma}, \partial_k)$ in (3.6-3.11). Hence, given any $w \in S_N$ and any decomposition $w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_l}$, the expression $s_{i_1,\gamma} \cdots s_{i_l,\gamma}$ is independent of the choice of the s_{i_m}, and we will denote this element of $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N))$ by w_γ.

Following Hikami [21] we study the intertwiner of the aforementioned two representations, restricted to a suitable function space.

Definition 3.2. *The* propagation operator *is the element of* $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}}))$ *determined by*

$$P^N|_{w^{-1}\mathbb{R}^N_+} = w^{-1} w_\gamma \qquad \text{for } w \in S_N. \tag{3.14}$$

This operator was introduced by Gutkin [15]. From (3.13) one obtains that P^N restricts to an element of $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^N))$; furthermore, since the $s_{j\,k,\gamma}$ restrict to elements of $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N))$, the propagation operator P^N restricts to an element[4] of $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N), \mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N))$. Crucially, P^N *intertwines* the integral and Dunkl-type representations of the dAHA [8, 21]:

$$w P^N = P^N w_\gamma \qquad \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N), \mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)), \tag{3.15}$$

$$\partial_{j,\gamma}(P^N|_{\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}}}) = (P^N \partial_j)|_{\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}}} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N), \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}})), \tag{3.16}$$

for $w \in S_N$ and $j = 1, \ldots, N$. (3.15) is established straightforwardly by making a variable substitution in the summation in P^N. (3.16) is shown on each alcove $w^{-1}\mathbb{R}^N_+$, where one uses (3.15) and the fact that $(w_\gamma, -\mathrm{i}\,\partial_j)$ defines a representation of the dAHA, so that we may use the well-known identity [4, 28, 32]

$$w_\gamma \partial_j = \partial_{w(j)} w_\gamma + \gamma w_\gamma \left(\sum_{k:(j,k)\in\Sigma_w} (s_{j\,k})_\gamma - \sum_{k:(k,j)\in\Sigma_w} (s_{j\,k})_\gamma \right).$$

3.3 Common eigenfunctions of the Dunkl-type operators

Let $j = 1, \ldots, N$ and $f \in \mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$; suppose that $\partial_{j,\gamma} f|_{\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}}} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}})$ is a constant multiple of $f|_{\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}}}$. Hence $\partial_{j,\gamma} f|_{\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}}}$ can be continuously extended to $\mathbb{R}^N$ and seen as an element of $\mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Therefore, given $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_N) \in \mathbb{C}^N$ the system $\{\partial_{j,\gamma} f = \mathrm{i}\,\lambda_j f\}_{j=1}^N$ for $f \in \mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is well-posed and we have

---

[4] Following [8] we repeat that P^N does not restrict to an element of $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N))$.

Definition 3.3. *Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. Then we have the following subspace of $\mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$:*

$$\mathrm{sol}_\gamma(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \left\{ f \in \mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \,\middle|\, \partial_{j,\gamma} f = \mathrm{i}\,\lambda_j f \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, N \right\} \tag{3.17}$$

Two technical lemmas follow.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ and $w \in S_N$. Suppose that $f \in \mathrm{sol}_\gamma(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ satisfies $f(\mathbf{0}) = 0$. If $f|_{v^{-1}\mathbb{R}^N_+} = 0$ for all $v \in S_N$ with $l(v) < l(w)$, then $f|_{w^{-1}\mathbb{R}^N_+} = 0$.*

Proof. Assume that for all $v \in S_N$ with $l(v) < l(w)$ we have $f|_{v^{-1}\mathbb{R}^N_+} = 0$. From (3.3) and the subsequent comments we conclude that $\Lambda_j f|_{w^{-1}\mathbb{R}^N_+} = 0$. Hence $\partial_j(f|_{w^{-1}\mathbb{R}^N_+}) = \partial_{j,\gamma} f|_{w^{-1}\mathbb{R}^N_+} = \mathrm{i}\,\lambda_j f|_{w^{-1}\mathbb{R}^N_+}$ for $j = 1, \dots, N$ so that $f|_{w^{-1}\mathbb{R}^N} = c_w\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ for some $c_w \in \mathbb{C}$. Continuity at $\boldsymbol{x} = \mathbf{0}$ yields that $f|_{w^{-1}\mathbb{R}^N} = 0$. ☐

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{C}^N$. Suppose that $f \in \mathrm{sol}_\gamma(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ satisfies $f(\mathbf{0}) = 0$. Then $f = 0$.*

Proof. First we will establish that $f|_{w^{-1}\mathbb{R}^N_+} = 0$ for all $w \in S_N$ by induction on $l(w)$; Lemma 3.4 implies both the base case $l(w) = 0$ (where there are no $v \in S_N$ for which $l(v) < l(w)$) and the induction step. Hence $f|_{\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}}} = 0$ and by continuity we have $f = 0$. ☐

Note that $\mathrm{sol}_0(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is 1-dimensional, and spanned by $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$. Something similar holds for general γ.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{C}^N$. $\mathrm{sol}_\gamma(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is 1-dimensional and spanned by $P^N \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $f, g \in \mathrm{sol}_\gamma(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ and $f \neq 0$, $g \neq 0$. We wish to show that f is a multiple of g. From Lemma 3.5 we conclude that $f(\mathbf{0}) \neq 0 \neq g(\mathbf{0})$ and the function $\tilde{g} := \frac{f(\mathbf{0})}{g(\mathbf{0})} g$ satisfies $f(\mathbf{0}) = \tilde{g}(\mathbf{0})$. Note that $h = f - \tilde{g}$ is also an element of $\mathrm{sol}_\gamma(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$, and $h(\mathbf{0}) = 0$. From Lemma 3.5 it follows that $h = 0$; hence f is a multiple of g. $P^N \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \in \mathrm{sol}_\gamma(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ follows from the intertwining property (3.16); it is nonzero since $P^N \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\mathbf{0}) = \lim_{\mathbb{R}^N_+ \ni \boldsymbol{x} \to \mathbf{0}} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \neq 0$. ☐

Definition 3.7. *Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{C}^N$. The corresponding* non-symmetric wavefunction *is defined as*

$$\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = P^N \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \in \mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

Lemma 3.8. *Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{C}^N$. For $j = 1, \dots, N-1$ we have*

$$s_j \psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \psi_{s_j\boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \mathrm{i}\,\gamma \frac{\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \psi_{s_j\boldsymbol{\lambda}}}{\lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1}}. \tag{3.18}$$

If $\lambda_j = \lambda_{j+1}$ the right-hand side is to be interpreted as a limit: $\lambda_{j+1} \to \lambda_j$.

Proof. Straightforwardly one finds that $I_j\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \frac{-\mathrm{i}}{\lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1}} \left(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\, s_j \boldsymbol{\lambda}} \right)$. Using this and the intertwining property (3.15) we obtain the lemma. ☐

Let $N > 1$ and $j = 1, \dots, N-1$. (3.18) implies that unless $\lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1} = -\mathrm{i}\,\gamma$ we see that $\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \neq s_j \psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$. It follows that for generic $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$, $\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ is not S_N-invariant.

Definition 3.9. *Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{C}^N$. The corresponding* symmetric wavefunction *is given by*

$$\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \mathcal{S}^N \psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \in \mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)^{S_N}.$$

3.4 Connection to the QNLS model

The relevance of the space $\mathrm{sol}_\gamma(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ to the QNLS problem is expressed in

Proposition 3.10. *Suppose that $f \in \mathrm{sol}_\gamma(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ for some $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{C}^N$. Then f solves (2.2-2.3) with $E = p_2(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$, i.e. it is a non-symmetric solution to the QNLS eigenvalue problem.*

Proof. (2.2) follows from $-\Delta|_{\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}}} = -p_2(\boldsymbol{\nabla}_\gamma)$, which is a consequence of (3.12) applied to $F = -p_2$. As for the derivative jump conditions (2.3), consider the hyperplane $V_{j\,k}$ with $1 \leq j < k \leq N$. Let $\boldsymbol{x} \in V_{j\,k}$ be subregular with $\boldsymbol{x}_\epsilon \in w^{-1}\mathbb{R}^N_+$, say, for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough. We know that $j = w^{-1}(r)$ and $k = w^{-1}(r+1)$ for some $r = 1, \ldots, N-1$ and hence $\Sigma_{s_r w} = \Sigma_w \cup \{(j,k)\}$ by (3.2). From $\boldsymbol{x}_{-\epsilon} \in s_{j\,k} w^{-1}\mathbb{R}^N_+ = (s_r w)^{-1}\mathbb{R}^N_+$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\left((\Lambda_j f)(\boldsymbol{x}_\epsilon) - (\Lambda_j f)(\boldsymbol{x}_{-\epsilon})\right) = \\
&= \lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\Big(\sum_{l:(l,j)\in\Sigma_w} (s_{j\,l} f)(\boldsymbol{x}_\epsilon) - \sum_{l:(j,l)\in\Sigma_w} (s_{j\,l} f)(\boldsymbol{x}_\epsilon) - \sum_{l:(l,j)\in\Sigma_{s_r w}} (s_{j\,l} f)(\boldsymbol{x}_{-\epsilon}) + \sum_{l:(j,l)\in\Sigma_{s_r w}} (s_{j\,l} f)(\boldsymbol{x}_{-\epsilon}) \Big) \\
&= \lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\Big(\sum_{l:(l,j)\in\Sigma_w} \left((s_{j\,l} f)(\boldsymbol{x}_\epsilon) - (s_{j\,l} f)(\boldsymbol{x}_{-\epsilon})\right) - \sum_{l:(j,l)\in\Sigma_w} \left((s_{j\,l} f)(\boldsymbol{x}_\epsilon) - (s_{j\,l} f)(\boldsymbol{x}_{-\epsilon})\right) + (s_{j\,k} f)(\boldsymbol{x}_{-\epsilon}) \Big) \\
&= f(\boldsymbol{x}),
\end{aligned}
$$

since all $s_{j\,l} f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Similarly, $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\left((\Lambda_k f)(\boldsymbol{x}_\epsilon) - (\Lambda_k f)(\boldsymbol{x}_{-\epsilon})\right) = -f(\boldsymbol{x})$. (2.3) now follows from $\partial_j f = \mathrm{i}\,\lambda_j f + \gamma \Lambda_j f$ and the continuity of f. ☐

By virtue of Prop. 3.6 we have

Proposition 3.11. *For all $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{C}^N$, $\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ satisfies (2.2-2.3) with $E = p_2(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$*

From Prop. 3.10 and Prop. 3.11 we obtain

Corollary 3.12. *Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{C}^N$. Then $\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ satisfies the derivative jump conditions* (2.3). *Furthermore, for any symmetric polynomial $F \in \mathbb{C}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}]^{S_N}$, $\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ is an eigenfunction of $F(\boldsymbol{\nabla}_\gamma)$ with eigenvalue $F(\mathrm{i}\,\boldsymbol{\lambda})$; in particular, $\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ solves* (2.2) *with $E = p_2(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$. Hence, $\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ is an eigenfunction of the QNLS Hamiltonian H_γ.*

Remark 3.13. *Symmetric polynomials in the $\partial_{j,\gamma}$ can be interpreted as constants of motion.*

Remark 3.14. *There also exists a large body of theory dealing with the fermionic QNLS model (e.g. [30, 31, 45]). Without going in detail, we remark that the physically relevant wavefunctions can in principle be constructed from the non-symmetric wavefunctions discussed in this article by antisymmetrizing, i.e. by calculating $\frac{1}{N!}\sum_{w\in S_N} \mathrm{sgn}(w)\psi(x_{w1}, \ldots, x_{wN})$.*

Assume J is bounded. We are interested under what conditions the restriction of the function $\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ to J^N can be extended to an L-periodic function on $\mathbb{R}^N$, i.e. invariant with respect to the translation group of the lattice $L\mathbb{Z}^N$. The following statement is well-known [25, 26] and can be straightforwardly checked.

Proposition 3.15. *Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{C}^N$. For $\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}|_{J^N}$ to be able to be extended to a function which is L-periodic in each argument, continuous and smooth away from the set of affine hyperplanes $V_{j,k;m} := \left\{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N_+ \,\middle|\, x_j - x_k = mL \right\}$, for $1 \leq j < k \leq N$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, it is necessary that the BAEs* (2.6) *are satisfied.*

Contrary to both the symmetric and the non-interacting ($\gamma = 0$) case, by imposing conditions on $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ one cannot extend the restricted non-symmetric wavefunction $\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}|_{J^N}$ to a function on $\mathbb{R}^N$ which is L-periodic in each variable. We will demonstrate this in the appendix A for $N = 2$.

We remark that Dunkl-type operators and integral-reflection operators, and hence also the propagation operator can be defined in the affine setting [8] as well. For the type A case, this means that the propagation operator generates a common eigenfunction of the Dunkl-type operators which satisfies the derivative jump conditions associated to the affine hyperplanes $V_{j\,k;m}$, but which itself is not invariant with respect to the action of the affine Weyl group $\hat{S}_N$, i.e. not symmetric and not invariant with respect to translations of the lattice $L\mathbb{Z}^N$.

4 Non-symmetric creation operators

We will describe operators $b^{\pm}_{\mu} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N), \mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}))$ that generate the non-symmetric wavefunctions recursively in two ways, viz.

$$\psi_{\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_{N+1}} = b^-_{\lambda_{N+1}} \psi_{\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_N} = b^+_{\lambda_1} \psi_{\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_{N+1}} \tag{4.1}$$

corresponding to adding a particle to an N-particle system from the left (b^+_μ) or the right (b^-_μ). We remark upon the similarity of (2.9) and (4.1), although in the former there is only one recursion, because the functions $\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ are also invariant with respect to permuting the λ_j.

4.1 Notations

Given integers $a < b$ and nonnegative integers n, N we introduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{i}^n_{[a,b]} &= \{\, (i_1, \ldots, i_n) \in (\mathbb{Z} \cap [a,b])^n \,|\, i_l \neq i_m \text{ for } l \neq m \,\}\,, \\ \mathfrak{I}^n_{[a,b]} &= \{\, (i_1, \ldots, i_n) \in (\mathbb{Z} \cap [a,b])^n \,|\, i_1 < \ldots < i_n \,\} \subset \mathfrak{i}^n_{[a,b]}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathfrak{i}^0_{[a,b]} = \mathfrak{I}^0_{[a,b]} = \{()\}$ and $\mathfrak{i}^n_{[a,b]} = \mathfrak{I}^n_{[a,b]} = \emptyset$ if $n < 0$ or $n > \lfloor b-a \rfloor$. Furthermore, S_N acts faithfully on $\mathfrak{i}^n_{[1,N]}$ in such a way that $\mathfrak{I}^n_{[1,N]}$ intersects each orbit in a point.

Given $1 \leq j < k \leq N$, define the *step operator* $\theta_{j\,k} \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^N))$ by

$$(\theta_{j\,k} f)(\boldsymbol{x}) = \begin{cases} f(\boldsymbol{x}), & x_j > x_k, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

which restricts to an endomorphism of $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}})$. Extending this to n-tuples, given $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{i}^n_{[1,N]}$, $n = 1, \ldots, N$, define

$$\theta_{\boldsymbol{i}} = \theta_{i_1 \ldots i_n} := \theta_{i_1 i_2} \cdots \theta_{i_{n-1} i_n} \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^N)),$$

We remark that $\theta_{\boldsymbol{i}}$ satisfies $w\theta_{\boldsymbol{i}} = \theta_{w\boldsymbol{i}} w$ for $w \in S_N$. It maps $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}})$ to itself and $\mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ to $\left\{ f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^N) \,\middle|\, f|_{\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}}} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}}) \right\}$.

To allow both recursions in (4.1) to be properly expressed, we will write $j^+ = j+1 \in \{1, \ldots, N+1\}$ given $j \in \{0, \ldots, N\}$ and, where convenient, $j^- = j \in \{1, \ldots, N+1\}$ given $j \in \{1, \ldots, N+1\}$. Extending this to n-tuples, write $\boldsymbol{i}^+ = (i_1+1, \ldots, i_n+1) \in \mathfrak{i}^n_{[1,N+1]}$ for $\boldsymbol{i} = (i_1, \ldots, i_n) \in \mathfrak{i}^n_{[0,N]}$; equally, write $\boldsymbol{i}^- = \boldsymbol{i}$ for $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{i}^n_{[1,N+1]}$. In the same vein, to an operator acting on a subspace of $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^N_{(\mathrm{reg})})$ we will associate an operator acting on the two subspaces of $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_{(\mathrm{reg})})$ resulting from the two obvious embeddings: $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^N_{(\mathrm{reg})}) \to \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_{(\mathrm{reg})})$.

- For $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{i}^n_{[0,N]}$, write $\theta^+_{\boldsymbol{i}} := \theta_{\boldsymbol{i}^+} \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}))$. For $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{i}^n_{[1,N+1]}$, write $\theta^-_{\boldsymbol{i}} := \theta_{\boldsymbol{i}} \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}))$.

- For $\epsilon = \pm$ and $j = 1, \dots, N-1$, write $s_j^\epsilon = s_{j^\epsilon} \in S_{N+1}$. Extending this to all of S_N by writing permutations as compositions of simple transpositions, given $w \in S_N$ we obtain $w^\epsilon \in S_{N+1}$ determined by $w^\epsilon(j^\epsilon) = (w(j))^\epsilon$ for $j = 1, \dots, N$, $w^+(1) = 1$ and $w^-(N+1) = N+1$. Using the integral representation of $\mathfrak{H}_\gamma^{N+1}$ we also write $w_\gamma^\epsilon = (w^\epsilon)_\gamma \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}))$ for $w \in S_N$.
- For $\epsilon = \pm$ and $j = 1, \dots, N$, define $\partial^\epsilon_{j\,(,\gamma)} := \partial_{j^\epsilon\,(,\gamma)} \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_{(\mathrm{reg})}))$.

Let $j = 1, \dots, N+1$. The assignment

$$(\hat{\phi}_j f)(\boldsymbol{x}) = f(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_{N+1}), \qquad \text{for } f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^N),\ \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1},$$

defines basic particle creation operators $\hat{\phi}_j \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^N), \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}))$. The $\hat{\phi}_j$ preserve smoothness on the alcoves and continuity, and hence restrict to elements of $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N), \mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}))$. Also, let $j = 1, \dots, N$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$. The assignment

$$(\bar{\phi}_j(y) f)(\boldsymbol{x}) = f(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, y, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_N), \qquad \text{for } f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^N), \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

defines $\bar{\phi}_j(y) \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^N))$; it preserves continuity and smoothness on the alcoves, and hence restricts to an element of $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N))$. Given $n = 0, \dots, N$, $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathrm{i}^n_{[1,N]}$ and $\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, in a multivariate setting we write

$$\bar{\phi}_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{y}) = \prod_{m=1}^n \bar{\phi}_{i_m}(y_m).$$

We have

$$w\bar{\phi}_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{y}) = \bar{\phi}_{w\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{y})w \qquad \text{for } w \in S_N.$$

Furthermore, if the particle number is clear from the context we will write only a sign, and not an index, on an operator that is associated to the left- and rightmost variable in these situations:

- Similarly, we denote $s^- = s_N, s^+ = s_1 \in S_{N+1}$, the simple transpositions acting on the first two and last two indices, respectively.
- We write $\hat{\phi}^+ = \hat{\phi}_1$, $\hat{\phi}^- = \hat{\phi}_{N+1} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^N), \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}))$.

For $\epsilon = \pm$ we have $\bar{\phi}_{\boldsymbol{i}^\epsilon}(\boldsymbol{y})\hat{\phi}^\epsilon = \hat{\phi}^\epsilon \bar{\phi}_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{y})$.

4.2 The operators $\hat{e}^\pm_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}}$ and $b^\pm_\mu$

Definition 4.1. *Let $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathrm{i}^n_{[1,N]}$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$. The* elementary (non-symmetric) creation operators *$\hat{e}^\pm_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^N), \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}))$ are defined by*

$$\hat{e}^+_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}} = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu x_1}\, \theta^+_{\boldsymbol{i}\,0} \left(\prod_{m=1}^n \int_{x_{i^+_{m+1}}}^{x_{i^+_m}} \mathrm{d}y_m\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_{i^+_m} - y_m)} \right) \hat{\phi}^+ \bar{\phi}_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{y}),$$

$$\hat{e}^-_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}} = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu x_{N+1}}\, \theta^-_{N+1\,\boldsymbol{i}} \left(\prod_{m=1}^n \int_{x_{i^-_m}}^{x_{i^-_{m-1}}} \mathrm{d}y_m\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_{i^-_m} - y_m)} \right) \hat{\phi}^- \bar{\phi}_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{y}),$$

where $i^+_{n+1} = 1$ and $i^-_0 = N+1$.

Given $\epsilon = \pm$, $\hat{e}^\epsilon_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}}$ preserves smoothness on the alcoves and vanishes continuously at the hyperplanes $V_{i^\epsilon_l\, i^\epsilon_m} \subset \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ for $1 \le l < m \le n+1$ and $0 \le l < m \le n$, respectively. Hence both $\hat{e}^\pm_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N), \mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}))$. Moreover, by restricting the arguments of the functions on which the $\hat{e}^{\pm}_{\mu}$ act to regular vectors, we may view $\hat{e}^{\pm}_{\mu} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}}), \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_{\mathrm{reg}}))$. For $w \in S_N$ and $\epsilon = \pm$ we have

$$w^\epsilon \hat{e}^\epsilon_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}} = \hat{e}^\epsilon_{\mu;w\boldsymbol{i}} w. \tag{4.2}$$

Note that for $n = 0$ and $\epsilon = \pm$ the above definitions $\hat{e}^\epsilon_\mu := \hat{e}^\epsilon_{\mu;\emptyset}$ simplify to

$$\begin{aligned}(\hat{e}^+_\mu f)(x_1,\dots,x_{N+1}) &= \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu x_1} f(x_2,\dots,x_{N+1})\\ (\hat{e}^-_\mu f)(x_1,\dots,x_{N+1}) &= \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu x_{N+1}} f(x_1,\dots,x_N),\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

which restrict to elements of $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N), \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}))$. The obvious statements $\hat{e}^+_\mu\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\mu,\boldsymbol{\lambda})}$, $\hat{e}^-_\mu\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\mu)}$ yield (4.1) in the case $\gamma = 0$.

Lemma 4.2 (Relation between $\hat{e}^+_{\boldsymbol{i}}$ and $\hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}}$)**.** *Let $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathrm{i}^n_{[1,N]}$. We have*

$$\hat{e}^+_{\boldsymbol{i}} = s_{1\,2}s_{2\,3}\dots s_{N\,N+1}s_{i_1\,i_2}s_{i_2\,i_3}\dots s_{i_n\,N+1}\hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}}\,.$$

Proof. By induction on n. For $n = 0$, the statement yields $\hat{e}^+ = s_{1\,2}s_{2\,3}\dots s_{N\,N+1}\hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}}$, which is obvious from (4.3). The induction step follows from the claim that given $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathrm{i}^n_{[1,N]}$ and $w \in S_{N+1}$, if $\hat{e}^+_{\boldsymbol{i}'} = w\hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}'}$ then $\hat{e}^+_{\boldsymbol{i}} = ws_{i_{n-1}\,i_n}\hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}}$, where $\boldsymbol{i}' = (i_1,\dots,i_{n-1})$, which is easily established. ☐

Definition 4.3. *Let $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\epsilon = \pm$. We define the* non-symmetric creation operators

$$b^\epsilon_\mu = \sum_{n=0}^{N} \gamma^n \sum_{\boldsymbol{i}\in\mathrm{i}^n_{[1,N]}} \hat{e}^\epsilon_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N), \mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{N+1})).$$

We may also think of $b^\pm_\mu$ as an element of $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}}), \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_{\mathrm{reg}}))$ or $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^N), \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}))$. From (4.2) it follows that for $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$, $w \in S_N$ and $\epsilon = \pm$ we have

$$w^\epsilon b^\epsilon_\mu = b^\epsilon_\mu w \tag{4.4}$$

4.3 Recursion of the $\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$

We now arrive at the heart of this paper, where we obtain the QISM-type recurrence relations (4.1) for the $\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$. One way to do this is by establishing certain commutation relations between $b^\pm_\mu$ and $\partial_{j,\gamma}$. More precisely, for $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\epsilon = \pm$ we have, in $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N_{\mathrm{reg}}), \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_{\mathrm{reg}}))$, the identities

$$\partial^\epsilon_{j,\gamma} b^\epsilon_\mu = b^\epsilon_\mu \partial_{j,\gamma} \qquad \text{for } j = 1,\dots,N. \tag{4.5}$$

$$\partial_{N+1,\gamma} b^-_\mu = \mathrm{i}\,\mu b^-_\mu, \quad \partial_{1,\gamma} b^+_\mu = \mathrm{i}\,\mu b^+_\mu, \tag{4.6}$$

For the proof of these identities, involving equating "coefficients" of the same power of γ, we refer to [44, App. B.2]. Note that $b^-_{\lambda_N}\cdots b^-_{\lambda_1}\Psi_\emptyset, b^+_{\lambda_1}\dots b^+_{\lambda_N}\Psi_\emptyset \in \mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ since $\Psi_\emptyset \in \mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^0) \cong \mathbb{C}$; one establishes that $b^-_{\lambda_N}\cdots b^-_{\lambda_1}\Psi_\emptyset, b^+_{\lambda_1}\dots b^+_{\lambda_N}\Psi_\emptyset \in \mathrm{sol}_\gamma(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ as follows:

$$\partial_{j,\gamma} b^-_{\lambda_N}\cdots b^-_{\lambda_1}\Psi_\emptyset = b^-_{\lambda_N}\partial_{j,\gamma} b^-_{\lambda_{N-1}}\cdots b^-_{\lambda_1}\Psi_\emptyset = \ldots = b^-_{\lambda_N}\cdots b^-_{\lambda_{j+1}}\partial_{j,\gamma} b^-_{\lambda_j}\cdots b^-_{\lambda_1}\Psi_\emptyset = \mathrm{i}\,\lambda_j b^-_{\lambda_N}\cdots b^-_{\lambda_1}\Psi_\emptyset$$

$$\partial_{j,\gamma} b^+_{\lambda_1}\cdots b^+_{\lambda_N}\Psi_\emptyset = b^+_{\lambda_1}\partial_{j-1,\gamma} b^+_{\lambda_2}\cdots b^+_{\lambda_N}\Psi_\emptyset = \ldots = b^+_{\lambda_1}\cdots b^+_{\lambda_{j-1}}\partial_{1,\gamma} b^+_{\lambda_j}\cdots b^+_{\lambda_N}\Psi_\emptyset = \mathrm{i}\,\lambda_j b^+_{\lambda_1}\cdots b^+_{\lambda_N}\Psi_\emptyset$$

by virtue of (4.5) and (4.6), as required. In light of Prop. 3.6, it follows that $b^-_{\lambda_N}\cdots b^-_{\lambda_1}\Psi_\emptyset$ and $b^+_{\lambda_1}\cdots b^+_{\lambda_N}\Psi_\emptyset$ are multiples of $\psi_{\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_N}$. To obtain equality, it suffices to show that they coincide on $\mathbb{R}^N_+$. This follows from (3.14) and $b^\epsilon_\mu f|_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} = \hat{e}^\epsilon_\mu f|_{\mathbb{R}^n_+}$ for $n = 0,\dots,N-1$ and $f \in \mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Remark 4.4. *(4.4) and (4.5) together express that the b^ϵ_μ intertwine the Dunkl-type representation of $\mathfrak{H}^N_\gamma$ with subrepresentations of the Dunkl-type representation of $\mathfrak{H}^{N+1}_\gamma$.*

We will derive (4.1) in a different way, however.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\epsilon = \pm$. In* $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N), \mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}))$ *we have*

$$P^{N+1} \hat{e}^\epsilon_\mu = b^\epsilon_\mu P^N.$$

Proof. We wish to prove $(P^{N+1}\hat{e}^\epsilon_\mu f)(\boldsymbol{x}) = (b^\epsilon_\mu P^N f)(\boldsymbol{x})$ for all $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$. Because the operators involved preserve continuity, it is sufficient to check the statement for $\boldsymbol{x}$ in the dense set $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_{\mathrm{reg}}$. Furthermore, because of (3.15) and $w^\epsilon_\gamma \hat{e}^\epsilon_\mu = \hat{e}^\epsilon_\mu w_\gamma$ for $w \in S_N$, we may assume $(x_1, \ldots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N_+$, i.e. $\boldsymbol{x} \in \cup_{m=1}^{N+1} s_N \cdots s_m \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+$ and it suffices to prove

$$P^{N+1}\hat{e}^\epsilon_\mu f|_{s_N \cdots s_m \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+} = b^\epsilon_\mu P^N f|_{s_N \cdots s_m \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+},$$

for all $m = 1, \ldots, N+1$. For $\epsilon = -$, this follows from Lemma B.4 and Lemma B.7. Using Lemma 4.2 the results from Appendix B can be straightforwardly modified to deal with $\epsilon = +$. ☐

Theorem 4.6 (Recursive construction for the non-symmetric wavefunction)**.** *Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{C}^N$. We have* (4.1)*, and hence*

$$\psi_{\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_N} = b^-_{\lambda_N} \cdots b^-_{\lambda_1} \Psi_\emptyset = b^+_{\lambda_1} \cdots b^+_{\lambda_N} \Psi_\emptyset \in \mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N). \tag{4.7}$$

Proof. This follows from the fact that $\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ can be written in two ways using Thm. 4.5:

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = P^N \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\boldsymbol{\lambda}} &= P^N \hat{e}^-_{\lambda_N} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_{N-1})} &&= b^-_{\lambda_N} P^{N-1} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_{N-1})} &&= b^-_{\lambda_N} \psi_{\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_{N-1}},\\
\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = P^N \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\boldsymbol{\lambda}} &= P^N \hat{e}^+_{\lambda_1} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_N)} &&= b^+_{\lambda_1} P^{N-1} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_N)} &&= b^+_{\lambda_1} \psi_{\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_N}.
\end{aligned}$$ ☐

The restrictions of (4.6-4.5) to the P^N-image of $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ now follow from arguments such as

$$\partial^\epsilon_{j,\gamma} b^\epsilon_\mu P_N = \partial^\epsilon_{j,\gamma} P_{N+1} \hat{e}^\epsilon_\mu = P_{N+1} \partial^\epsilon_j \hat{e}^\epsilon_\mu = P_{N+1} \hat{e}^\epsilon_\mu \partial_j = b^\epsilon_\mu P_N \partial_j = b^\epsilon_\mu \partial_{j,\gamma} P_N.$$

4.4 Commuting the $b^\pm_\mu$ on the span of the $\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$

Consider the following subspace of $\mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$:

$$\mathfrak{z}_N := \mathrm{Sp}\left\{ \psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \,\middle|\, \boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{C}^N \right\}.$$

By virtue of (4.1) $b^\pm_\mu$ both map $\mathfrak{z}_N$ to $\mathfrak{z}_{N+1}$, for all $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$. We will now study the commutation relations among the $b^\pm_\mu$ acting on these subspaces $\mathfrak{z}_N$.

Remark 4.7. *We do not claim that $\mathfrak{z}_N = \mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Therefore we do not prove that the commutation relations among the $b^\pm_\mu$ hold on the entire $\mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$, although we do conjecture this. They may be obtainable in another way, e.g. by using the γ-expansions for $b^\pm_\mu$.*

First of all, from (4.1) it is immediately clear that

Proposition 4.8. *For all $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{C}$ we have*

$$[b^+_\mu, b^-_\nu] = 0 \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathfrak{z}_N, \mathfrak{z}_{N+2}). \tag{4.8}$$

As for the commutation relation of two creation operators of the *same* sign, we have

Proposition 4.9. *Given $\epsilon = \pm$ and $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{C}$ we have*

$$s^\epsilon b^\epsilon_\mu b^\epsilon_\nu - b^\epsilon_\nu b^\epsilon_\mu = \frac{-\epsilon\,\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\mu - \nu}\left[b^\epsilon_\mu, b^\epsilon_\nu\right] \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathfrak{z}_N, \mathfrak{z}_{N+2}). \tag{4.9}$$

For $\mu = \nu$ the right-hand sides represent the limits $-\epsilon\,\mathrm{i}\,\gamma \lim_{\nu \to \mu} \frac{[b^\epsilon_\mu, b^\epsilon_\nu]}{\mu - \nu}$.

Proof. It suffices to prove the stated identities when applied to $\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ with $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ arbitrary. By virtue of (4.1) in the case $\mu \neq \nu$ we need to show that

$$\begin{aligned} s_1 \psi_{\mu,\nu,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} &= \psi_{\nu,\mu,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \frac{\mathrm{i}\gamma}{\mu - \nu} \left(\psi_{\mu,\nu,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \psi_{\nu,\mu,\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \right), \\ s_{N+1} \psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda},\nu,\mu} &= \psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda},\mu,\nu} + \frac{\mathrm{i}\gamma}{\mu - \nu} \left(\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda},\nu,\mu} - \psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda},\mu,\nu} \right), \end{aligned}$$

but this is precisely what is stated in Lemma 3.8 with $N \to N+2$ for $j = 1$ (taking $\lambda_1 = \mu, \lambda_2 = \nu$) and $j = N+1$ (taking $\lambda_{N-1} = \nu, \lambda_{N+2} = \mu$). The case $\mu = \nu$ follows from the case $\mu \neq \nu$ by taking limits and noting that the propagation operator preserves continuity. ☐

5 The non-symmetric Yang-Baxter algebra

There is a natural embedding of $\mathcal{C}(J^N)$ into the Hilbert space $\mathfrak{h}_N = \mathrm{L}^2(J^N)$, which contains the dense subspace

$$\mathfrak{d}_N := \mathcal{C}^\infty_{\mathrm{cpt}}(J^N) \tag{5.1}$$

of *test functions*, viz. smooth functions with compact support. The *(non-symmetric) Fock space* $\mathfrak{h}$, the subset of the direct sum of all $\mathfrak{h}_N$ consisting of elements of finite L^2-norm, is also a Hilbert space with respect to $(\,,\,)$ and contains the dense subspace of *finite vectors*

$$\mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{fin}} := \left\{ f \in \mathfrak{h} \,\middle|\, \exists M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} : \, f \in \bigoplus_{N=0}^{M} \mathfrak{h}_N \right\}. \tag{5.2}$$

By restricting the arguments of functions acted upon by $\hat{\phi}_j, \hat{e}^{\pm}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}}, b^{\pm}_{\mu}$ to J we may view these operators as acting on $\mathcal{C}(J^N)$. Furthermore, they are densely-defined linear maps : $\mathfrak{h} \to \mathfrak{h}$.

From now onwords, throughout sections 5 and 6, assume that J is bounded; we have $x_+ - x_- = L$. We note that, given μ, the elementary integral operators $\hat{e}^{\pm}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}}$, and hence the operators $b^{\pm}_{\mu}$, are bounded operators[5] and may therefore be considered as elements of $\mathrm{End}(\mathfrak{h})$. This means they can be composed with other elements of $\mathrm{End}(\mathfrak{h})$. We will now construct operators $a^{\pm}_{\mu}$ and $c^{\pm}_{\mu}$ out of the non-symmetric creation operators $b^{\pm}_{\mu}$ and show that they satisfy commutation relations akin to some of the relations in (2.8).

5.1 The operators $a^{\pm}_{\mu}$

Given $y \in J$, the assignments

$$(\check{\phi}^+(y) f)(\boldsymbol{x}) = f(y, \boldsymbol{x}), \qquad (\check{\phi}^-(y) f)(\boldsymbol{x}) = f(\boldsymbol{x}, y),$$

for $f \in \mathcal{F}(J^{N+1})$, $\boldsymbol{x} \in J^N$ define $\check{\phi}^{\pm}(y) \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathfrak{h}_{N+1}, \mathfrak{h}_N)$. Given $\epsilon = \pm$, write $\check{\phi}^{\epsilon} := \check{\phi}^{\epsilon}(x_{-\epsilon})$. We have

$$[\check{\phi}^+, \check{\phi}^-] = 0, \tag{5.3}$$

$$(\check{\phi}^{\epsilon})^2 (1 - s^{\epsilon}) = 0, \qquad \text{for } \epsilon = \pm. \tag{5.4}$$

Lemma 5.1. *Let* $\epsilon = \pm$, $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$, $n = 0, \ldots, N-1$ *and* $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{i}^n_{[1,N-1]}$. *Then in* $\mathrm{End}(\mathfrak{h})$ *we have*

$$\hat{e}^{\epsilon}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}} \check{\phi}^{\epsilon} = \check{\phi}^{\epsilon} s^{\epsilon} \hat{e}^{\pm}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}^{\epsilon}}, \tag{5.5}$$

$$b^{\epsilon}_{\mu} \check{\phi}^{\epsilon} = \check{\phi}^{\epsilon} s^{\epsilon} b^{\epsilon}_{\mu}. \tag{5.6}$$

---

[5] A proof for this statement could go along the same lines as [17, Props. 6.2.1 and 6.2.2].

Proof. Note that (5.5) is equivalent to the statements

$$\begin{aligned}(\hat{e}^{+}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}}\check{\phi}^{+}f)(x_1,\ldots,x_N) &= (\hat{e}^{+}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}^{+}}f)(x_1,y,x_2,\ldots,x_N),\\ (\hat{e}^{-}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}}\check{\phi}^{-}f)(x_1,\ldots,x_N) &= (\hat{e}^{-}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}^{-}}f)(x_1,\ldots,x_{N-1},y,x_N),\end{aligned}$$

for every $f \in \mathfrak{h}_N$ and $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1,\ldots,x_N) \in J^N$; and this follows since the respective left- and right-hand sides equal

$$\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu x_1}\,\theta_{\boldsymbol{i}^{+}\,1}(\boldsymbol{x})\left(\prod_{m=1}^{n}\int_{x_{i^{+}_{m+1}}}^{x^{+}_{i_m}} \mathrm{d}y_m\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_{i^{+}_m}-y_m)}\right)(\bar{\phi}_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{y})f)(y,x_2,\ldots,x_N)$$

and

$$\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu x_N}\,\theta_{N\,\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{x})\left(\prod_{m=1}^{n}\int_{x_{i_m}}^{x_{i_{m-1}}} \mathrm{d}y_m\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_{i_m}-y_m)}\right)(\bar{\phi}_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{y})f)(x_1,\ldots,x_{N-1},y).$$

To demonstrate (5.6), we show that $\sum_{\boldsymbol{i}\in\mathfrak{i}^n_{[1,N-1]}}\hat{e}^{+}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}}\check{\phi}^{+} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{i}\in\mathfrak{i}^n_{[1,N]}}\check{\phi}^{+}s^{+}\hat{e}^{+}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}}$ for $x_1,\ldots,x_N > y$. Indeed,

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{i}\in\mathfrak{i}^n_{[1,N-1]}}\hat{e}^{+}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}}\check{\phi}^{+} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{i}\in\mathfrak{i}^n_{[1,N-1]}}\check{\phi}^{+}s^{+}\hat{e}^{+}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}^{+}} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{i}\in\mathfrak{i}^n_{[2,N]}}\check{\phi}^{+}s^{+}\hat{e}^{+}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{i}\in\mathfrak{i}^n_{[1,N]}}\check{\phi}^{+}s^{+}\hat{e}^{+}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}},$$

where we have applied (5.5) and used that $\check{\phi}^{+}s^{+}\hat{e}^{+}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}} = 0$ if $i_m = 1$ for some m. A similar argument can be made for the product $\check{\phi}^{-}s^{-}b^{-}_{\mu}$. ☐

Out of the non-symmetric particle creation operators $b^{\pm}_{\mu}$ and $\check{\phi}^{\pm}$ two new operators can be constructed that are endomorphisms of $\mathfrak{h}_N$; in particular, they preserve the particle number.

Definition 5.2. *Let $\epsilon = \pm$, $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$, $n = 0,\ldots,N$ and $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{i}^n_{[1,N]}$. Define*

$$\bar{e}^{\epsilon}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}} = \check{\phi}^{\epsilon}\hat{e}^{\epsilon}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}} \in \mathrm{End}(\mathfrak{h}_N).$$

In other words,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{e}^{+}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}} &= \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu x_{-}}\,\theta_{\boldsymbol{i}}\left(\prod_{m=1}^{n}\int_{x_{i_{m+1}}}^{x_{i_m}} \mathrm{d}y_m\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_{i_m}-y_m)}\right)\bar{\phi}_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{y}),\\ \hat{e}^{-}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}} &= \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu x_{+}}\,\theta_{\boldsymbol{i}}\left(\prod_{m=1}^{n}\int_{x_{i_m}}^{x_{i_{m-1}}} \mathrm{d}y_m\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_{i_m}-y_m)}\right)\bar{\phi}_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{y}),\end{aligned}$$

where $x_{i_{n+1}} = x_{-}$ and $x_{i_0} = x_{+}$. Furthermore, define

$$a^{\epsilon}_{\mu} = \check{\phi}^{\epsilon}b^{\epsilon}_{\mu} = \sum_{n\geq 0}\gamma^n\sum_{\boldsymbol{i}\in\mathfrak{i}^n_{[1,N]}}\bar{e}^{\epsilon}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}} \in \mathrm{End}(\mathfrak{h}_N).$$

Similar to the situation for $b^{\pm}_{\mu}$, the operators $a^{\pm}_{\mu}$ are bounded on their domain of definition and may therefore be viewed as elements of $\mathrm{End}(\mathfrak{h})$; in particular, they may be composed with other such elements. From (4.4), for $w \in S_N$ and $\epsilon = \pm$, we obtain the identities

$$[w, a^{\epsilon}_{\mu}] = 0 \in \mathrm{End}(\mathfrak{h}_N). \tag{5.7}$$

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\epsilon = \pm$. We have $b^{\epsilon}_{\mu}a^{\epsilon}_{\nu} = \check{\phi}^{\epsilon}s^{\epsilon}b^{\epsilon}_{\mu}b^{\epsilon}_{\nu} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathfrak{h}_N, \mathfrak{h}_{N+1})$.*

Proof. Directly from (5.6) and the definitions of $a^{\pm}_{\mu}$. ☐

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$, $n = 0, \ldots, N$ and $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{i}^n_{[1,N]}$, we have the formal adjointness relations*

$$\left(\bar{e}^+_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}}\right)^* = \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\,\bar{\mu}(x_+ + x_-)}\,\bar{e}^-_{\bar{\mu};\boldsymbol{i}}, \qquad \left(a^+_\mu\right)^* = \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\,\bar{\mu}(x_+ + x_-)}\,a^-_{\bar{\mu}}.$$

Proof. The first statement can be easily checked by comparing the inner products $\left(\bar{e}^+_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}} f, g\right)$ and $\left(f, \bar{e}^-_{\bar{\mu};\boldsymbol{i}} g\right)$ for arbitrary $f, g \in \mathfrak{d}_N$. The statement relating a^+_μ and $a^-_{\bar{\mu}}$ is obtained by summing over all tuples $\boldsymbol{i}$. ☐

5.2 The operators $c^\pm_\mu$

The formal adjoint of $b^\pm_\mu$ has not been considered yet.

Definition 5.5. *Let $\epsilon = \pm$, $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$, $n = 0, \ldots, N$ and $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{i}^n_{[1,N]}$, the operators $\check{e}^\epsilon_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathfrak{h}_{N+1}, \mathfrak{h}_N)$ are densely defined by*

$$\begin{aligned}
\check{e}^+_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}}|_{\mathfrak{d}_{N+1}} &= \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu x_-}\,\theta_{\boldsymbol{i}} \left(\prod_{m=0}^{n} \int_{x_{i_{m+1}}}^{x_{i_m}} \mathrm{d}y_m\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_{i_m} - y_m)} \right) \bar{\phi}_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{y}) \check{\phi}^-(y_0), \\
\check{e}^-_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}}|_{\mathfrak{d}_{N+1}} &= \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu x_+}\,\theta_{\boldsymbol{i}} \left(\prod_{m=1}^{n+1} \int_{x_{i_m}}^{x_{i_{m-1}}} \mathrm{d}y_m\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_{i_m} - y_m)} \right) \bar{\phi}_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{y}) \check{\phi}^+(y_{n+1}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $x_{i_{n+1}} = x_-$ and $x_{i_0} = x_+$. Furthermore we define $c^\epsilon_\mu \in \mathrm{End}(\mathfrak{h})$ by $c^\epsilon_\mu|_{\mathfrak{h}_0} = 0$ and

$$c^\epsilon_\mu|_{\mathfrak{h}_N} = \sum_{n=0}^{N} \gamma^{n+1} \sum_{\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{i}^n_{[1,N]}} \check{e}^\epsilon_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathfrak{h}_{N+1}, \mathfrak{h}_N).$$

Lemma 5.6. *Given $\epsilon = \pm$, $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$, $n = 0, \ldots, N$ and $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{i}^n_{[1,N]}$, we have the formal adjointness relations*

$$\left(\hat{e}^\epsilon_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}}\right)^* = \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\,\bar{\mu}(x_+ + x_-)}\,\check{e}^{-\epsilon}_{\bar{\mu};\boldsymbol{i}}, \qquad \left(b^\epsilon_\mu\right)^* = \gamma^{-1}\,\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\,\bar{\mu}(x_+ + x_-)}\,c^{-\epsilon}_{\bar{\mu}}.$$

Proof. In the same way as for Lemma 5.4. ☐

Lemma 5.7. *Given $\epsilon = \pm$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ we have, in $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathfrak{h}_{N+1}, \mathfrak{h}_N)$,*

$$c^\epsilon_\mu = [\check{\phi}^{-\epsilon}, a^\epsilon_\mu] = \check{\phi}^\epsilon [\check{\phi}^{-\epsilon}, b^\epsilon_\mu]. \tag{5.8}$$

Proof. For $\boldsymbol{x} \in J^N$, in $(b^+_\mu f)(x_+, \boldsymbol{x}, x_-)$ split the summation over $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{i}^n_{[1,N]}$ according to whether i_1 equals N or not, corresponding to the terms appearing in $(c^+_\mu f)(\boldsymbol{x})$ and $(a^+_\mu f)(x_+, \boldsymbol{x})$, respectively. Then use $\check{\phi}^+ \check{\phi}^- b^+_\mu = \check{\phi}^- a^+_\mu$. A similar argument for c^-_μ is used. ☐

Again, it can be verified that the operators $c^\pm_\mu$ are bounded on their domain of definition and may therefore be viewed as elements of $\mathrm{End}(\mathfrak{h})$; in particular, they may be composed with other such elements. First of all, from (4.4) and Lemma 5.6 for $w \in S_N$ and $\epsilon = \pm$ we obtain

$$w c^\epsilon_\mu = c^\epsilon_\mu w^{-\epsilon} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathfrak{h}_{N+1}, \mathfrak{h}_N). \tag{5.9}$$

5.3 Non-symmetric Yang-Baxter relations

The operators $a^\pm_\mu, b^\pm_\mu, c^\pm_\mu$ generate a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{h}$ which we will call the *non-symmetric Yang-Baxter algebra.* Given $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{C}$ we can formulate commutation relations, to be referred to as the *(non-symmetric) Yang-Baxter relations*, between $a^\pm_\mu$, $b^\pm_\mu$ and $c^\pm_\mu$, on the subspace $\bar{\mathfrak{z}}_N$, given by

$$\bar{\mathfrak{z}}_N := \overline{\mathrm{Sp}\,\{\, \psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}|_{J^N} \mid \boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{C}^N \,\}} \subset \mathfrak{h}_N.$$

Theorem 5.8. *Given $\epsilon = \pm$, $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{C}$, we have*

$$a^\epsilon_\mu b^\epsilon_\nu = \frac{\mu - \nu + \epsilon\,\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\mu - \nu} b^\epsilon_\nu a^\epsilon_\mu - \frac{\epsilon\,\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\mu - \nu} b^\epsilon_\mu a^\epsilon_\nu \qquad \in \mathrm{Hom}(\bar{\mathfrak{z}}_N, \bar{\mathfrak{z}}_{N+1}), \tag{5.10}$$

$$c^\epsilon_\mu a^\epsilon_\nu = \frac{\mu - \nu - \epsilon\,\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\mu - \nu} a^\epsilon_\nu c^\epsilon_\mu + \frac{\epsilon\,\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\mu - \nu} a^\epsilon_\mu c^\epsilon_\nu \qquad \in \mathrm{Hom}(\bar{\mathfrak{z}}_{N+1}, \bar{\mathfrak{z}}_N). \tag{5.11}$$

Proof. Left-multiplying (4.9) by $\check{\phi}^\epsilon s^\epsilon$ yields

$$\check{\phi}^\epsilon b^\epsilon_\mu b^\epsilon_\nu - \check{\phi}^\epsilon s^\epsilon b^\epsilon_\nu b^\epsilon_\mu = \frac{-\epsilon\,\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\mu - \nu}\left(\check{\phi}^\epsilon s^\epsilon b^\epsilon_\mu b^\epsilon_\nu - \check{\phi}^\epsilon s^\epsilon b^\epsilon_\nu b^\epsilon_\mu\right).$$

Lemma 5.3 and the definition of a^ϵ_μ now imply (5.10). We obtain (5.11) by taking adjoints. ☐

Theorem 5.9. *Given $\epsilon = \pm$, $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{C}$, we have*

$$\left[a^\epsilon_\mu, a^\epsilon_\nu\right] = 0 \in \mathrm{End}(\bar{\mathfrak{z}}_N). \tag{5.12}$$

Proof. By virtue of (5.6) and (5.4) we have

$$a^\epsilon_\mu a^\epsilon_\nu = \phi^\epsilon b^\epsilon_\mu \phi^\epsilon b^\epsilon_\nu = (\phi^\epsilon)^2 s^\epsilon b^\epsilon_\mu b^\epsilon_\nu = (\phi^\epsilon)^2 b^\epsilon_\mu b^\epsilon_\nu.$$

Clearly it suffices to prove that

$$(\phi^\epsilon)^2 b^\epsilon_\nu b^\epsilon_\mu = (\phi^\epsilon)^2 b^\epsilon_\mu b^\epsilon_\nu. \tag{5.13}$$

(4.9) yields

$$b^\epsilon_\nu b^\epsilon_\mu = \frac{(\mu - \nu) s^\epsilon + \epsilon\,\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\mu - \nu + \epsilon\,\mathrm{i}\,\gamma} b^\epsilon_\mu b^\epsilon_\nu;$$

left-multiplying by $(\phi^\epsilon)^2$ and applying (5.4) again we obtain (5.13). ☐

By restricting (4.8) to J and taking its formal adjoint we obtain

Theorem 5.10. *Given $\epsilon = \pm$ and $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{C}$ we have*

$$\left[b^\epsilon_\mu, b^\epsilon_\nu\right] = 0 \in \mathrm{Hom}(\bar{\mathfrak{z}}_N, \bar{\mathfrak{z}}_{N+2}), \tag{5.14}$$

$$\left[c^\epsilon_\mu, c^\epsilon_\nu\right] = 0 \in \mathrm{Hom}(\bar{\mathfrak{z}}_{N+2}, \bar{\mathfrak{z}}_N). \tag{5.15}$$

We also obtain a commutation relation involving a^+_μ and a^-_ν.

Theorem 5.11. *Given $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{C}$ we have*

$$[a^+_\mu, a^-_\nu] = c^-_\nu b^+_\mu - c^+_\mu b^-_\nu \in \mathrm{End}(\bar{\mathfrak{z}}_N); \tag{5.16}$$

In particular, $[a^+_\mu, a^-_\nu]$ is not invariant under $\mu \leftrightarrow \nu$.

Proof. Focusing on the right-hand side, we have

$$c^-_\nu b^+_\mu - c^+_\mu b^-_\nu = \check{\phi}^+ a^-_\nu b^+_\mu - a^-_\nu \check{\phi}^+ b^+_\mu - \check{\phi}^- a^+_\mu b^-_\nu + a^+_\mu \check{\phi}^- b^-_\nu,$$

by virtue of (5.8). Now using the definition of $a^\pm_\mu$ in terms of $b^\pm_\mu$ as well as (5.14) and (5.3) we obtain the result. ☐

5.4 A partial algebraic Bethe ansatz for the $\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$

The statements Thm. 5.8 allow us to express $a^{\pm}_{\mu}\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ as linear combinations of eigenfunctions $\psi_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ where $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ ranges over the set of N-tuples whose entries are distinct elements of the set $\{\mu, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N\}$.

Theorem 5.12. *Given* $n = 0, \dots, N$, $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{I}^n_{[1,N]}$, $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ *and* $\lambda_0, \lambda_{N+1} \in \mathbb{C}$, *we write* $i_0 = 0$ *and* $i_{n+1} = N+1$ *and we have*

$$a^{+}_{\lambda_0}\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \sum_{n=0}^{N} \sum_{\boldsymbol{i}\in\mathfrak{I}^n_{[1,N]}} a^{+}_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda};\lambda_0)\psi_{\lambda_1,\dots,\underset{(i_1)}{\lambda_{i_0}},\dots,\underset{(i_2)}{\lambda_{i_1}},\dots,\underset{(i_n)}{\lambda_{i_{n-1}}},\dots,\lambda_N}, \tag{5.17}$$

$$a^{-}_{\lambda_{N+1}}\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \sum_{n=0}^{N} \sum_{\boldsymbol{i}\in\mathfrak{I}^n_{[1,N]}} a^{-}_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda};\lambda_{N+1})\psi_{\lambda_1,\dots,\underset{(i_1)}{\lambda_{i_2}},\dots,\underset{(i_2)}{\lambda_{i_3}},\dots,\underset{(i_n)}{\lambda_{i_{n+1}}},\dots,\lambda_N}. \tag{5.18}$$

The $a^{\pm}_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda};\mu)$ *are defined by the recursions*

$$\begin{aligned}
a^{+}_{\boldsymbol{i}^+}(\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_N;\mu) &= \frac{\lambda_1-\mu-\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_1-\mu} a_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\lambda_2,\dots,\lambda_N;\mu), && \text{for } \boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{I}^n_{[1,N-1]},\\
a^{+}_{1\,(\boldsymbol{i}')^+}(\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_N;\mu) &= \frac{\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_1-\mu} a_{\boldsymbol{i}'}(\lambda_2,\dots,\lambda_N;\lambda_1), && \text{for } \boldsymbol{i}' \in \mathfrak{I}^{n-1}_{[1,N-1]},\\
a^{-}_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_N;\mu) &= \frac{\lambda_N-\mu+\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_N-\mu} d_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_{N-1};\mu), && \text{for } \boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{I}^n_{[1,N-1]},\\
a^{-}_{\boldsymbol{i}'\,N}(\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_N;\mu) &= \frac{-\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_N-\mu} d_{\boldsymbol{i}'}(\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_{N-1};\lambda_N), && \text{for } \boldsymbol{i}' \in \mathfrak{I}^{n-1}_{[1,N-1]},
\end{aligned}$$

and the initial values $a^{\epsilon}_{\emptyset}(\emptyset;\mu) = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu x_{-\epsilon}}$ *for* $\epsilon = \pm$.

Proof. We present the proof for the expression for $a^{-}_{\lambda_{N+1}}\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$; the expression for $a^{+}_{\lambda_0}\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ is established along the same lines. The proof is by induction on N; the $N = 0$ case reproduces $a^{-}_{\lambda_{N+1}}\Psi_{\emptyset} = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_{N+1}x_+}\,\Psi_{\emptyset}$. Assuming the statement for N, we will prove it with N replaced by $N+1$, using (4.1) and (5.8). Writing $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N)$ we have

$$a^{-}_{\lambda_{N+2}}\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda},\lambda_{N+1}} = \frac{\lambda_{N+1}-\lambda_{N+2}+\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_{N+1}-\lambda_{N+2}} b^{-}_{\lambda_{N+1}} a^{-}_{\lambda_{N+2}}\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \frac{\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_{N+1}-\lambda_{N+2}} b^{-}_{\lambda_{N+2}} a^{-}_{\lambda_{N+1}}\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}.$$

Using the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
a^{-}_{\lambda_{N+2}}\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda},\lambda_{N+1}} &= \sum_{n=0}^{N} \sum_{\boldsymbol{i}\in\mathfrak{I}^n_{[1,N]}} \frac{\lambda_{N+1}-\lambda_{N+2}+\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_{N+1}-\lambda_{N+2}} a^{-}_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda};\lambda_{N+2})\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_{i_1}x_+}\,\psi_{\lambda_1,\dots,\underset{(i_1)}{\lambda_{i_2}},\dots,\underset{(i_n)}{\lambda_{N+2}},\dots,\lambda_N,\lambda_{N+1}} + \\
&\quad + \sum_{n=0}^{N} \sum_{\boldsymbol{i}\in\mathfrak{I}^n_{[1,N]}} \frac{-\,\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_{N+1}-\lambda_{N+2}} a^{-}_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda};\lambda_{N+1})\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_{i_1}x_+}\,\psi_{\lambda_1,\dots,\underset{(i_1)}{\lambda_{i_2}},\dots,\underset{(i_n)}{\lambda_{N+1}},\dots,\lambda_N,\lambda_{N+2}} \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{N} \sum_{\boldsymbol{i}\in\mathfrak{I}^n_{[1,N]}} a^{-}_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\lambda_{N+1};\lambda_{N+2})\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_{i_1}x_+}\,\psi_{\lambda_1,\dots,\underset{(i_1)}{\lambda_{i_2}},\dots,\underset{(i_n)}{\lambda_{i_{n+1}}},\dots,\lambda_N,\lambda_{N+1}} + \\
&\quad + \sum_{n=1}^{N+1} \sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{i}\in\mathfrak{I}^n_{[1,N+1]}\\ i_n=N+1}} a^{-}_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\lambda_{N+1};\lambda_{N+2})\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_{i_1}x_+}\,\psi_{\lambda_1,\dots,\underset{(i_1)}{\lambda_{i_2}},\dots,\underset{(i_{n-1})}{\lambda_{i_n}},\dots,\lambda_N,\underset{(N+1)}{\lambda_{N+2}}}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the recursion for the coefficient functions $a^-_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda};\mu)$. Hence, using the decomposition $\mathfrak{I}^n_{[1,N+1]} = \left(\mathfrak{I}^{n-1}_{[1,N]} \times \{N+1\}\right) \cup \mathfrak{I}^n_{[1,N]}$ into disjoint subsets, we indeed obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} a^-_{\lambda_{N+2}} \psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda},\lambda_{N+1}} &= \sum_{n=0}^{N+1} \left(\sum_{\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{I}^n_{[1,N]}} a^-_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\lambda_{N+1};\lambda_{N+2})\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_{i_1} x_+}\, \psi_{\lambda_1,\dots,\underset{(i_1)}{\lambda_{i_2}},\dots,\underset{(i_n)}{\lambda_{i_{n+1}}},\dots,\lambda_N,\lambda_{N+1}} + \right. \\ &\qquad \left. + \sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{I}^n_{[1,N+1]} \\ i_n = N+1}} a^-_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\lambda_{N+1};\lambda_{N+2})\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_{i_1} x_+}\, \psi_{\lambda_1,\dots,\underset{(i_1)}{\lambda_{i_2}},\dots,\underset{(i_{n-1})}{\lambda_{i_n}},\dots,\lambda_N,\underset{(N+1)}{\lambda_{N+2}}} \right) \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{N+1} \sum_{\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{I}^n_{[1,N+1]}} a^-_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\lambda_{N+1};\lambda_{N+2})\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_{i_1} x_+}\, \psi_{\lambda_1,\dots,\underset{(i_1)}{\lambda_{i_2}},\dots,\underset{(i_n)}{\lambda_{i_{n+1}}},\dots,\lambda_{N+1}}. \qquad \square \end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.13. *Thm. 5.12 provides a partial analogue of the ABA in the non-symmetric setting. In the symmetric case, the action of the operators A_μ, D_μ on $\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \mathcal{S}^N \psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ can be obtained by replacing $a^+_\mu \to A_\mu, a^-_\mu \to D_\mu$ in (5.17-5.18); then identities such as*

$$\frac{-\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_j-\mu}\frac{\lambda_k-\mu+\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_k-\mu} + \frac{-\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_j-\lambda_k}\frac{-\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_k-\mu} = \frac{-\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_j-\mu}\frac{\lambda_j-\lambda_k-\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_j-\lambda_k} \tag{5.19}$$

allow one to combine coefficients of the (equal) eigenfunctions $\Psi_{\dots,\underset{j}{\mu},\dots,\underset{k}{\lambda_k},\dots}$ and $\Psi_{\dots,\underset{j}{\lambda_k},\dots,\underset{k}{\mu},\dots}$ in the expansion of $D_\mu \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$. After having combined terms in the expansion of $A_\mu \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ in an analogous manner one may set coefficients of "unwanted" terms in the expansion of $(A_\mu + D_\mu)\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ to zero by imposing the BAEs (2.6)*. The failure of the ABA in the non-symmetric case owes to the fact that $\psi_{\dots,\underset{j}{\mu},\dots,\underset{k}{\lambda_k},\dots} \neq \psi_{\dots,\underset{j}{\lambda_k},\dots,\underset{k}{\mu},\dots}$ so that* (5.19) *cannot be used to combine coefficients.*

6 Recovering the symmetric Yang-Baxter algebra

Note that the commutation relations involving $a^\pm_\mu, b^\pm_\mu, c^\pm_\mu$, viz. (5.10), (5.11), (5.12), (5.14), and (5.15) are of the exact same form as some of the established commutation relations involving $A_\mu, B_\mu, C_\mu, D_\mu$ appearing in (2.8), i.e. by replacing lower case letters by uppercase letters these non-symmetric and symmetric Yang-Baxter relations transform into each other. In fact, we can prove these relations, and further highlight why the operators $a^\pm_\mu, b^\pm_\mu, c^\pm_\mu$ are relevant to the study of the QNLS model, by defining the operators $A_\mu, B_\mu, C_\mu, D_\mu$ in terms of the operators $a^\pm_\mu, b^\pm_\mu, c^\pm_\mu$.

Consider

$$J^N_+ := \mathbb{R}^N_+ \cap (x_-, x_+)^N = \left\{\, \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N \,\middle|\, x_+ > x_1 > \ldots > x_N > x_- \,\right\}$$

so that $J^N = \overline{\cup_{w \in S_N} w J^N_+}$. Given $F \in \mathcal{H}_N$, $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$, $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{i}^n_{[1,N]}$ and $\epsilon = \pm$, it can be checked that

$$\mathcal{S}^{N+1} \hat{e}^\epsilon_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}} F|_{J^{N+1}_+} = \frac{(N-n)!}{(N+1)!} \sum_{\boldsymbol{j} \in \mathfrak{I}^{n+1}_{[1,N+1]}} \hat{E}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{j}} F|_{J^{N+1}_+},$$

where $\hat{E}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{H}_N, \mathcal{H}_{N+1})$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\hat{E}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}} F\right)(x_1,\dots,x_{N+1}) = \left(\prod_{m=1}^n \int_{x_{i_{m+1}}}^{x_{i_m}} \mathrm{d}y_m \right) \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\left(\sum_{m=1}^{n+1} x_{i_m} - \sum_{m=1}^n y_m\right)}\,. \\ F(x_1,\dots,\widehat{x_{i_1}},\dots,\widehat{x_{i_{n+1}}},\dots,x_{N+1},y_1,\dots,y_n) \end{aligned}$$

for $F \in \mathcal{H}_N$, $\boldsymbol{x} \in J_+^{N+1}$. In particular, the restricted function $\mathcal{S}^{N+1} \hat{e}^{\epsilon}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}} F|_{J_+^{N+1}}$ is independent of $\boldsymbol{i}$ and ϵ. Since $|\mathfrak{i}^n_{[1,N]}| = \frac{N!}{(N-n)!}$, it follows that

$$\mathcal{S}^{N+1} b^{\pm}_{\mu} F|_{J_+^{N+1}} = \frac{1}{N+1} \sum_{n=0}^{N} \gamma^n \sum_{\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{I}^{n+1}_{[1,N+1]}} \hat{E}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}} F|_{J_+^{N+1}}.$$

Hence we define

$$B_\mu := \mathcal{S}^{N+1} b^{\pm}_{\mu}|_{\mathcal{H}_N} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{H}_N, \mathcal{H}_{N+1}). \tag{6.1}$$

This $B_\mu = \frac{1}{N+1} \sum_{n=0}^{N} \gamma^n \sum_{\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{I}^{n+1}_{[1,N+1]}} \hat{E}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}}$ is the known top-left entry of the QNLS monodromy matrix $\mathcal{T}_\mu$ [17, 25, 37].

Using (5.7) it is clear that $a^{\pm}_{\mu}$ maps S_N-invariant functions to S_N-invariant functions. Equally from (5.9) it follows that $c^{\pm}_{\mu}$ maps S_{N+1}-invariant functions to S_N-invariant functions; furthermore given $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$, $n = 0, \dots, N-1$ and $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{i}^n_{[1,N-1]}$, the elementary operators $\check{e}^{\pm}_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}}$ coincide on $\mathcal{H}_N$ as can be easily checked, so that $c^{\pm}_{\mu}$ coincide on $\mathcal{H}_N$. Hence, we define the other QNLS monodromy matrix entries A_μ, C_μ, D_μ [17, 25, 37] as follows

$$A_\mu := a^{+}_{\mu}|_{\mathcal{H}_N} \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H}_N), \qquad D_\mu := a^{-}_{\mu}|_{\mathcal{H}_N} \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H}_N), \qquad C_\mu := c^{\pm}_{\mu}|_{\mathcal{H}_{N+1}} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{H}_{N+1}, \mathcal{H}_N).$$

Now the commutation relations in (2.8) except the ones involving all of $A_\mu, B_\mu, C_\mu, D_\mu$ can be derived. For example,

$$\begin{aligned}[B_\mu, A_\nu] + \frac{\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\mu - \nu}\left(A_\mu B_\nu - A_\nu B_\mu\right) &= \left(B_\mu a^{+}_{\nu} - A_\nu \mathcal{S}^{N+1} b^{+}_{\mu} + \frac{\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\mu - \nu}\left(A_\mu \mathcal{S}^{N+1} b^{+}_{\nu} - A_\nu \mathcal{S}^{N+1} b^{+}_{\mu}\right)\right)|_{\mathcal{H}_N} \\ &= \mathcal{S}^{N+1}\left(b^{+}_{\mu} a^{+}_{\nu} - \mathcal{S}^{N+1} a^{+}_{\nu} b^{+}_{\mu} + \frac{\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\mu - \nu} \mathcal{S}^{N+1}\left(a^{+}_{\mu} b^{+}_{\nu} - a^{+}_{\nu} b^{+}_{\mu}\right)\right)|_{\mathcal{H}_N},\end{aligned}$$

which vanishes by virtue of (5.10).

Remark 6.1. *It remains an open problem to derive relations such as*

$$[A_\mu, D_\nu] = \frac{-\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\mu - \nu}\left(B_\mu C_\nu - B_\nu C_\mu\right)$$

using this formalism. Equally, the non-symmetric commutation relations (5.16) *cannot be restricted to relations involving only the symmetric operators $A_\mu, B_\mu, C_\mu, D_\mu$. Moreover, the precise relation of the non-symmetric Yang-Baxter algebra to the YBE* (2.7) *and the Yangian of $\mathfrak{gl}_2$ is unclear. We reiterate that the non-symmetric relations obtained in sections 4.4 and 5.3 are proven on the closure of the span of the $\psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ only. The symmetrized relations obtained here must correspondingly hold on the closure of the span of the $\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$, which is known [5] to be equal to the whole $\mathcal{H}_N$.*

We may view the definition (6.1) of B_μ as an identity in $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)^{S_N}, \mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{N+1})^{S_{N+1}})$. Then by virtue of (4.4) we obtain

Theorem 6.2. *Let $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\epsilon = \pm$. We have*

$$\mathcal{S}^{N+1} b^{\epsilon}_{\mu} = B_\mu \mathcal{S}^N \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N), \mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{N+1})^{S_{N+1}}).$$

Hence, a new dAHA-based proof follows for the recursion (2.9) obtained in the QISM; writing $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{N+1})$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}' = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N)$ we have

$$\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \mathcal{S}^{N+1} \psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \mathcal{S}^{N+1} b^{-}_{\lambda_{N+1}} \psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}'} = B_{\lambda_{N+1}} \mathcal{S}^N \psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = B_{\lambda_{N+1}} \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}.$$

Combining Thm. 4.5 and Thm. 6.2, we obtain the following scheme for the recursive construction of $\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
1 \arrow[r, "\hat{e}^-_{\lambda_1}"] \arrow[d, "P^0"] & \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_1} \arrow[r, "\hat{e}^-_{\lambda_2}"] \arrow[d, "P^1"] & \ldots \arrow[r, "\hat{e}^-_{\lambda_{N-1}}"] & \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_{N-1})} \arrow[r, "\hat{e}^-_{\lambda_N}"] \arrow[d, "P^{N-1}"] & \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_N)} \arrow[d, "P^N"] \\
1 \arrow[r, "b^-_{\lambda_1}"] \arrow[d, "\mathcal{S}^0"] & \psi_{\lambda_1} \arrow[r, "b^-_{\lambda_2}"] \arrow[d, "\mathcal{S}^1"] & \ldots \arrow[r, "b^-_{\lambda_{N-1}}"] & \psi_{\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_{N-1}} \arrow[r, "b^-_{\lambda_N}"] \arrow[d, "\mathcal{S}^{N-1}"] & \psi_{\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_N} \arrow[d, "\mathcal{S}^N"] \\
1 \arrow[r, "B_{\lambda_1}"] & \Psi_{\lambda_1} \arrow[r, "B_{\lambda_2}"] & \ldots \arrow[r, "B_{\lambda_{N-1}}"] & \Psi_{\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_{N-1}} \arrow[r, "B_{\lambda_N}"] & \Psi_{\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_N}
\end{tikzcd}$$

Note that the three operators $\hat{e}^-_\mu$, b^-_μ, B_μ coincide when acting on $\mathfrak{h}_0$ or $\mathfrak{h}_1$; equivalently, $P^0 = P^1 = \mathcal{S}^0 = \mathcal{S}^1 = 1$. A second scheme may be created by replacing $\hat{e}^-_{\lambda_j} \to \hat{e}^+_{\lambda_{N-j+1}}$, $b^-_{\lambda_j} \to b^+_{\lambda_{N-j+1}}$, $B_{\lambda_j} \to B_{\lambda_{N-j+1}}$ and each partial tuple $(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_j) \to (\lambda_{N-j+1}, \ldots, \lambda_N)$.

Appendices

A Explicit formulae for $N = 2$

The Dunkl-type operators $\partial_{1,\gamma}$, $\partial_{2,\gamma} \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2_{\mathrm{reg}}))$ are defined by

$$(\partial_{1,\gamma} f)(x_1, x_2) = (\partial_1 f)(x_1, x_2) + \begin{cases} 0, & x_1 > x_2 \\ \gamma f(x_2, x_1), & x_2 > x_1, \end{cases}$$
$$(\partial_{2,\gamma} f)(x_1, x_2) = (\partial_2 f)(x_1, x_2) - \begin{cases} 0, & x_1 > x_2 \\ \gamma f(x_2, x_1), & x_2 > x_1, \end{cases}.$$

Together with $s_1 \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2_{\mathrm{reg}}))$ defined by $(s_1 f)(x_1, x_2) = f(x_2, x_1)$ they represent the degenerate affine Hecke algebra, meaning that

$$s_1^2 = 1, \quad s_1 \partial_{1,\gamma} - \partial_{2,\gamma} s_1 = \gamma, \quad [\partial_{1,\gamma}, \partial_{2,\gamma}] = 0.$$

Furthermore, we have the integral-reflection operator $s_{1,\gamma} = s_1 + \gamma I_{12} \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2))$ where

$$(I_{12} f)(x_1, x_2) = \int_0^{x_1 - x_2} \mathrm{d}y\, f(x_1 - y, x_2 + y)$$

which with the partial differential operators ∂_1, ∂_2 also represent the degenerate affine Hecke algebra:

$$s_{1,\gamma}^2 = 1, \quad s_{1,\gamma} \partial_1 - \partial_2 s_{1,\gamma} = \gamma, \quad [\partial_1, \partial_2] = 0.$$

Write θ_{12} for the multiplication operator corresponding to the characteristic function of the alcove $\mathbb{R}^2_+$; then $\theta_{21} = s_{12}\theta_{12}s_{12}$ corresponds to the characteristic function of the other alcove $s_1\mathbb{R}^2_+$. The propagation operator $P^2 \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2), \mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2))$ is defined by $P^2|_{\mathbb{R}^2_+} = 1$ and $P^2|_{s_1\mathbb{R}^2_+} = s_1 s_{1,\gamma} = 1 - \gamma I_{12}$, i.e. $P^2 = 1 - \gamma\theta_{21} I_{12}$ and satisfies the intertwining relations

$$s_1 P^2 = P^2 s_{1,\gamma}, \qquad \partial_{j,\gamma}(P^2|_{\mathbb{R}^2_{\mathrm{reg}}}) = (P^2 \partial_j)|_{\mathbb{R}^2_{\mathrm{reg}}} \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2.$$

$\psi_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2} = P^2\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2)}$ spans the solution space of the system $\partial_{1,\gamma} f = \mathrm{i}\,\lambda_1 f$, $\partial_{2,\gamma} f = \mathrm{i}\,\lambda_2 f$ in $\mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2_{\mathrm{reg}})$. We have

$$\psi_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2} = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2)} + \gamma\theta_{21} I_{21}\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2)} = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2)} + \frac{\mathrm{i}\,\gamma\theta_{21}}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} \left(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2)} - \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\lambda_2,\lambda_1)} \right). \tag{A.1}$$

The symmetrized eigenfunction is now given by

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2} &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\psi_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2}+s_1\psi_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2}\right)\\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\theta_{12}\left(\frac{\lambda_1-\lambda_2-\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_1-\lambda_2}\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2)}+\frac{\lambda_1-\lambda_2+\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_1-\lambda_2}\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\lambda_2,\lambda_1)}\right)+\right.\\ &\qquad\left.+\,\theta_{21}\left(\frac{\lambda_1-\lambda_2+\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_1-\lambda_2}\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2)}+\frac{\lambda_1-\lambda_2-\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_1-\lambda_2}\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\lambda_2,\lambda_1)}\right)\right)\\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\lambda_1-\lambda_2-\mathrm{sgn}_{1\,2}\,\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_1-\lambda_2}\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2)}+\frac{\lambda_1-\lambda_2+\mathrm{sgn}_{1\,2}\,\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_1-\lambda_2}\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\lambda_2,\lambda_1)}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathrm{sgn}_{1\,2}=\theta_{12}-\theta_{21}$. By restricting $\Psi_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2}$ to J^2, where $J=[x_-,x_+]$ with $x_+-x_-=L$, and imposing the Bethe ansatz equations

$$\frac{\lambda_1-\lambda_2+\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_1-\lambda_2-\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}=\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_1 L}=\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_2 L},$$

$\Psi_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2}|_{J^2}$ can be extended to a function L-periodic in each variable. However such an extension for $\psi_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2}|_{J^2}$ does not exist, unless $\gamma=0$. Indeed, from (A.1) it follows that periodicity in the first argument, viz. $\psi_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2}(x_-,x)=\psi_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2}(x_+,x)$ for $x\in J$, amounts to

$$\frac{\lambda_1-\lambda_2+\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_1-\lambda_2}\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_1 x_-}\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_2 x}-\frac{\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_1-\lambda_2}\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_2 x_-}\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_1 x}=\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_1 x_+}\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_2 x}$$

i.e.

$$\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)x}=\frac{\lambda_1-\lambda_2+\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)x_-}-\frac{\lambda_1-\lambda_2}{\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\lambda_1 x_+-\lambda_2 x_-)}$$

For this to hold for all $x\in J$, it is necessary that $\lambda_1=\lambda_2$, which leads to a contradiction as follows. By De l'Hôpital's rule we have

$$\psi_{\lambda,\lambda}(x_1,x_2):=\lim_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2\to\lambda}\psi_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2}(x_1,x_2)=\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda(x_1+x_2)}\left(1+\begin{cases}0, & x_1>x_2\\ \gamma(x_2-x_1), & x_2>x_1\end{cases}\right).$$

Hence $\psi_{\lambda,\lambda}(x_-,x)=\psi_{\lambda,\lambda}(x_+,x)$ for all $x\in J$ implies that for all such x, $1+\gamma(x-x_-)=\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda(x_+-x_-)}$, contradicting $\gamma\neq 0$. Periodicity in the second argument can be ruled out in the same way.

The non-symmetric creation operators can be used to construct $\psi_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2}$ from the pseudovacuum $\Psi_\emptyset=1$ by means of $\psi_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2}=b^-_{\lambda_2}b^-_{\lambda_1}\Psi_\emptyset=b^+_{\lambda_1}b^+_{\lambda_2}\Psi_\emptyset$ and are given by

(From $N=0$ to $N=1$) For $f\in\mathbb{C}$ and $x\in\mathbb{R}$ we have $(b^\pm_\mu f)(x)=\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu x}\,f$.

(From $N=1$ to $N=2$) For $f\in\mathcal{CB}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and $(x_1,x_2)\in\mathbb{R}^2$ we have

$$(b^-_\mu f)(x_1,x_2)=\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu x_2}\,f(x_1)+\begin{cases}0, & x_1>x_2\\ \gamma\int_{x_1}^{x_2}\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_1+x_2-y)}\,f(y), & x_2>x_1\end{cases};$$

$$(b^+_\mu f)(x_1,x_2)=\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu x_1}\,f(x_2)+\begin{cases}0, & x_1>x_2\\ \gamma\int_{x_1}^{x_2}\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_1+x_2-y)}\,f(y), & x_2>x_1\end{cases}.$$

The operators $a^\pm_\mu$ are given by

$(N=0)$ For $f\in\mathbb{C}$ we have $a^\pm_\mu f=\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu x_\mp}\,f$.

$(N=1)$ For $f\in\mathfrak{h}_1$ and $x\in J$ we have

$$(a^-_\mu f)(x)=\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu x_+}\,f(x)+\gamma\int_x^{x_+}\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_++x-y)}\,f(y);$$

$$(a_\mu^+ f)(x) = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu x_-}\, f(x) + \gamma \int_{x_-}^{x} \mathrm{d}y\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_- + x - y)}\, f(y).$$

$(N = 2)$ For $f \in \mathfrak{h}_2$ and $(x_1, x_2) \in J^2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(a_\mu^- f)(x_1, x_2) = \\
&= \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu x_+}\, f(x_1, x_2) + \gamma \int_{x_1}^{x_+} \mathrm{d}y\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_+ + x_1 - y)}\, f(y, x_2) + \gamma \int_{x_2}^{x_+} \mathrm{d}y\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_+ + x_2 - y)}\, f(x_1, y) + \\
&\qquad + \begin{cases} \gamma^2 \int_{x_1}^{x_+} \mathrm{d}y_1 \int_{x_2}^{x_1} \mathrm{d}y_2\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_+ + x_1 + x_2 - y_1 - y_2)}\, f(y_1, y_2), & x_1 > x_2 \\ \gamma^2 \int_{x_1}^{x_2} \mathrm{d}y_1 \int_{x_2}^{x_+} \mathrm{d}y_2\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_+ + x_1 + x_2 - y_1 - y_2)}\, f(y_1, y_2), & x_2 > x_1 \end{cases}; \\
&(a_\mu^+ f)(x_1, x_2) = \\
&= \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu x_-}\, f(x_1, x_2) + \gamma \int_{x_-}^{x_1} \mathrm{d}y\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_- + x_1 - y)}\, f(y, x_2) + \gamma \int_{x_-}^{x_2} \mathrm{d}y\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_- + x_2 - y)}\, f(x_1, y) + \\
&\qquad + \begin{cases} \gamma^2 \int_{x_2}^{x_1} \mathrm{d}y_1 \int_{x_-}^{x_2} \mathrm{d}y_2\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_- + x_1 + x_2 - y_1 - y_2)}\, f(y_1, y_2), & x_1 > x_2 \\ \gamma^2 \int_{x_-}^{x_1} \mathrm{d}y_1 \int_{x_1}^{x_2} \mathrm{d}y_2\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_- + x_1 + x_2 - y_1 - y_2)}\, f(y_1, y_2), & x_2 > x_1 \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

leading to the following expressions for $a_\mu^\pm \psi_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2}$ as per Thm. 5.12:

$$\begin{aligned}
a_\mu^+ \psi_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2} &= \frac{\mu - \lambda_1 + \mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\mu - \lambda_1} \frac{\mu - \lambda_2 + \mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\mu - \lambda_2}\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu x_-}\, \psi_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2} + \frac{-\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\mu - \lambda_1} \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + \mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_1 x_-}\, \psi_{\mu,\lambda_2} + \\
&\quad + \frac{\mu - \lambda_1 + \mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\mu - \lambda_1} \frac{-\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\mu - \lambda_2}\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_2 x_-}\, \psi_{\lambda_1,\mu} + \frac{-\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\mu - \lambda_1} \frac{-\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_2 x_-}\, \psi_{\mu,\lambda_1}, \\
a_\mu^- \psi_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2} &= \frac{\lambda_1 - \mu + \mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_1 - \mu} \frac{\lambda_2 - \mu + \mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_2 - \mu}\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu x_+}\, \psi_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2} + \frac{-\,\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_1 - \mu} \frac{\lambda_2 - \mu + \mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_2 - \mu}\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_1 x_+}\, \psi_{\mu,\lambda_2} + \\
&\quad + \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + \mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} \frac{-\,\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_2 - \mu}\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_2 x_+}\, \psi_{\lambda_1,\mu} + \frac{-\,\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} \frac{-\,\mathrm{i}\,\gamma}{\lambda_2 - \mu}\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\lambda_1 x_+}\, \psi_{\lambda_2,\mu}.
\end{aligned}$$

B Commutation relations between $\hat{e}^\pm_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}}$ and $I_{j\,k}$

In this appendix we present lemmas used in the proof of the key result Thm. 4.5. We shall use the following notations and conventions:

- We assume that $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ is arbitrary but fixed and hence drop μ from the notation: $\hat{e}^\pm_{\boldsymbol{i}} = \hat{e}^\pm_{\mu;\boldsymbol{i}}$.
- Given $n = 0, \ldots, N$ and $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{i}^n_{[1,N]}$ we introduce

$$I_{\boldsymbol{i}} := I_{i_1\, i_2} \cdots I_{i_1\, i_n} \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^N)), \qquad I'_{\boldsymbol{i}} := \theta_{\boldsymbol{i}} I_{\boldsymbol{i}} \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^N)).$$

- Given $n, p, q = 0, \ldots, N$ such that $n + p = q$, as well as $\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathfrak{I}^q_{[1,N]}$, introduce the set of decompositions of $\boldsymbol{k}$:

$$\mathrm{Dcmp}_{n,p}(\boldsymbol{k}) = \left\{ (\boldsymbol{i}, \boldsymbol{j}) \in \mathfrak{I}^n_{[1,N]} \times \mathfrak{I}^p_{[1,N]} \,\middle|\, \forall l, m : \, i_l \neq j_m \right\}.$$

- Given $n = 0, \ldots, N$, $j = 1, \ldots, N$ and $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{I}^n_{[1,N]}$ such that $j \neq i_l$ for any l, the "next label" function $\mathrm{nxt}_j(\boldsymbol{i}) = \min\{\, i_l \,|\, i_l > j \,\}$.
- Given $n = 0, \ldots, N$, fix $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{I}^n_{[1,N]}$. An entry i_r is termed an *initial entry* or an *terminal entry* if $i_r - 1$ or $i_r + 1 \neq i_m$ for any m, respectively. The number of initial and terminal entries is the same (it is the number of consecutive runs in $\boldsymbol{i}$), and is denoted l. We denote by $(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_l)$ the ordered subtuple of $\boldsymbol{i}$ consisting of its initial entries, and by $(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_l)$ the ordered subtuple of $\boldsymbol{i}$ consisting of its terminal entries. We have $\sigma_k \leq \tau_k$ for $k = 1, \ldots, l$ and $\tau_k < \sigma_{k+1} - 1$ for $k = 1, \ldots, l - 1$.

For example, let $N = 10$ and $\boldsymbol{i} = (2,4,5,6,9,10)$. Then $l = 3$ and $(\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\sigma_3) = (2,4,9)$ and $(\tau_1,\tau_2,\tau_3) = (2,6,10)$. For $j = 1,3,7,8$ we have $\mathrm{nxt}_j(\boldsymbol{i}) = 2,4,9,9$.

Lemma B.1. *Let $n = 1,\ldots,N$, $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{I}^n_{[1,N]}$ and $j < i_1$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} I'_{N+1\,j}\hat{e}^- &= \hat{e}^-_j; &\text{(B.1)}\\ I'_{N+1\,j}\hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}} &= \hat{e}^-_{j\,\boldsymbol{i}} + \hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}} I'_{i_1\,j}. &\text{(B.2)}\end{aligned}$$

Proof. (B.1) is immediate; for (B.2) it is sufficient to prove that

$$(I_{N+1\,j}\hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}}\,f)(\boldsymbol{x}) = (\hat{e}^-_{j\,\boldsymbol{i}}f)(\boldsymbol{x}) + (\hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}}\theta_{i_1\,j}I_{i_1\,j}f)(\boldsymbol{x})$$

for $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1,\ldots,x_{N+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ such that $x_{N+1} > x_{i_1} > \ldots > x_{i_n}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}(I_{N+1\,j}\hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}}\,f)(\boldsymbol{x}) &= \int_{x_j}^{x_{N+1}} \mathrm{d}y_0 \int_{x_{i_1}}^{x_{N+1}+x_j-y_0} \mathrm{d}y_1 \tilde{f}_{y_0,y_1}(\boldsymbol{x});\\ (\hat{e}^-_{j\,\boldsymbol{i}}f)(\boldsymbol{x}) &= \int_{x_j}^{x_{N+1}} \mathrm{d}y_0 \int_{x_{i_1}}^{x_j} \mathrm{d}y_1 \tilde{f}_{y_0,y_1}(\boldsymbol{x}),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{f}_{y_0,y_1}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \int_{x_{i_2}}^{x_{i_1}} \mathrm{d}y_2 \cdots \int_{x_{i_n}}^{x_{i_{n-1}}} \mathrm{d}y_n\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_{N+1}+x_j+x_{i_1}+\ldots+x_{i_n}-y_0-y_1-\ldots-y_n)}\,\cdot\\ \cdot f(x_1,\ldots,\underset{(i_1)}{y_1},\ldots,\underset{(i_n)}{y_n},\ldots,x_N).\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}(\hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}}\theta_{i_1\,j}I_{i_1\,j}f)(\boldsymbol{x}) &= \int_{x_{i_1}}^{x_{N+1}} \mathrm{d}y_1 \cdots \int_{x_{i_n}}^{x_{i_{n-1}}} \mathrm{d}y_n\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_{N+1}+x_{i_1}+\ldots+x_{i_n}-y_1-\ldots-y_n)}\,\cdot\\ &\quad\cdot(\theta_{i_1\,j}I_{i_1\,j}f)(x_1,\ldots,\underset{(i_1)}{y_1},\ldots,\underset{(i_n)}{y_n},\ldots,x_N)\\ &= \int_{x_j}^{x_{N+1}} \mathrm{d}y_1 \int_{x_{i_2}}^{x_{i_1}} \mathrm{d}y_2 \cdots \int_{x_{i_n}}^{x_{i_{n-1}}} \mathrm{d}y_n\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_{N+1}+x_{i_1}+\ldots+x_{i_n}-y_1-\ldots-y_n)}\,\cdot\\ &\quad\cdot\int_{x_j}^{y_1} \mathrm{d}y_0 f(x_1,\ldots,\underset{(j)}{y_0},\ldots,\underset{(i_1)}{x_j+y_1-y_0},\ldots,\underset{(i_n)}{y_n},\ldots,x_N)\\ &= \int_{x_j}^{x_{N+1}} \mathrm{d}y_0 \int_{y_0}^{x_{N+1}} \mathrm{d}y_1 \int_{x_{i_2}}^{x_{i_1}} \mathrm{d}y_2 \cdots \int_{x_{i_n}}^{x_{i_{n-1}}} \mathrm{d}y_n\, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\mu(x_{N+1}+x_{i_1}+\ldots+x_{i_n}-y_1-\ldots-y_n)}\,\cdot\\ &\quad\cdot f(x_1,\ldots,\underset{(j)}{y_0},\ldots,\underset{(i_1)}{x_j+y_1-y_0},\ldots,\underset{(i_n)}{y_n},\ldots,x_N)\\ &= \int_{x_j}^{x_{N+1}} \mathrm{d}y_0 \int_{x_j}^{x_j+x_{N+1}-y_0} \mathrm{d}y_1 \tilde{f}_{y_0,y_1}(\boldsymbol{x}),\end{aligned}$$

where we have changed the order of integration of the integrals over y_0 and y_1, and substituted $y_1 \to x_j + y_1 - y_0$. The following decomposition (up to sets of zero measure) for $x_{N+1} > x_j > x_{i_1}$ completes the proof:

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\{\,(y_0,y_1) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \,\middle|\, x_{N+1} > y_0 > x_j,\ x_j + x_{N+1} - y_0 > y_1 > x_{i_1}\,\right\} =\\ &= \left\{\,(y_0,y_1) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \,\middle|\, x_{N+1} > y_0 > x_j > y_1 > x_{i_1}\,\right\} \cup\\ &\quad \cup \left\{\,(y_0,y_1) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \,\middle|\, x_{N+1} > y_0 > x_j,\ x_j + x_{N+1} - y_0 > y_1 > x_j\,\right\}. \qquad \square\end{aligned}$$

Lemma B.2. *Let* $q = 1, \dots, N$ *and* $\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathfrak{I}^q_{[1,N]}$. *Then*

$$I'_{N+1\,\boldsymbol{k}}\hat{e}^- = \sum_{n+p=q} \sum_{\substack{(\boldsymbol{i},\boldsymbol{j}) \in \mathrm{Dcmp}_{n,p}(\boldsymbol{k}) \\ i_n = k_q}} \hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}} I'_{\mathrm{nxt}_{j_1}(\boldsymbol{i})\,j_1} \cdots I'_{\mathrm{nxt}_{j_p}(\boldsymbol{i})\,j_p}.$$

Proof. By induction on q. The case $q = 1$ is equivalent to (B.1); the set $\mathrm{Dcmp}_{n,p}(\boldsymbol{k})$ is empty unless $n = 1, p = 0$, in which case $\mathrm{Dcmp}_{1,0}((k_1)) = \{((i_1), ())\}$. Writing $\boldsymbol{k}' = (k_2, \dots, k_q)$, for the induction step we have

$$\begin{aligned} I'_{N+1\,\boldsymbol{k}}\hat{e}^- = I'_{N+1\,k_1} I'_{N+1\,\boldsymbol{k}'}\hat{e}^- &= \sum_{n+p=q-1} \sum_{\substack{(\boldsymbol{i},\boldsymbol{j}) \in \mathrm{Dcmp}_{n,p}(\boldsymbol{k}') \\ i_n = k_{q-1}}} I'_{N+1\,k_1} \hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}} I'_{\mathrm{nxt}_{j_1}(\boldsymbol{i})\,j_1} \cdots I'_{\mathrm{nxt}_{j_p}(\boldsymbol{i})\,j_p} \\ &= \sum_{n+p=q-1} \Bigg(\sum_{\substack{(\boldsymbol{i},\boldsymbol{j}) \in \mathrm{Dcmp}_{n,p}(\boldsymbol{k}') \\ i_n = k_{q-1}}} \hat{e}^-_{k_1\,\boldsymbol{i}} I'_{\mathrm{nxt}_{j_1}(\boldsymbol{i})\,j_1} \cdots I'_{\mathrm{nxt}_{j_p}(\boldsymbol{i})\,j_p} + \\ &\qquad + \sum_{\substack{(\boldsymbol{i},\boldsymbol{j}) \in \mathrm{Dcmp}_{n,p}(\boldsymbol{k}') \\ i_n = k_{q-1}}} \hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}} I'_{i_1\,k_1} I'_{\mathrm{nxt}_{j_1}(\boldsymbol{i})\,j_1} \cdots I'_{\mathrm{nxt}_{j_p}(\boldsymbol{i})\,j_p} \Bigg), \end{aligned}$$

where we have applied the induction hypothesis and (B.2). One completes the induction step by re-writing the first summation as one over $((k_1, \boldsymbol{i}), \boldsymbol{j}) \in \mathrm{Dcmp}_{n+1,p}(\boldsymbol{k})$ and the second summation as one over $(\boldsymbol{i}, (k_1, \boldsymbol{j})) \in \mathrm{Dcmp}_{n,p+1}(\boldsymbol{k})$. ☐

Lemma B.3. *Let* $m = 1, \dots, N+1$. *On* $s_N \cdots s_m \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+$ *we have*

$$P^{N+1} e^- = \sum_{n \geq 0} \gamma^n \sum_{\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{I}^n_{[m,N]}} \hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}} \sum_{p \geq 0} \sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{j} \in \mathfrak{I}^p_{[m,i_n)} \\ \forall r,s\colon i_r \neq j_s}} \Big(\gamma I'_{\mathrm{nxt}_{j_1}(\boldsymbol{i})\,j_1}\Big) \cdots \Big(\gamma I'_{\mathrm{nxt}_{j_p}(\boldsymbol{i})\,j_p}\Big).$$

Proof. The condition $\boldsymbol{x} \in s_N \cdots s_m \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+$ is equivalent to $x_1 > \ldots > x_{m-1} > x_{N+1} > x_m > \ldots > x_N$. From (3.14) we obtain

$$P^{N+1} = s_N \cdots s_m s_{m,\gamma} \cdots s_{N,\gamma} = (1 + \gamma I_{N+1\,m}) \cdots (1 + \gamma I_{N+1\,N}) = \sum_{q \geq 0} \gamma^q \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathfrak{I}^q_{[m,N]}} I_{N+1\,k_1} \cdots I_{N+1\,k_q},$$

so that by virtue of Lemma B.2 we find that

$$\begin{aligned} P^{N+1}\hat{e}^- &= \sum_{q \geq 0} \gamma^q \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathfrak{I}^q_{[m,N]}} I'_{N+1\,\boldsymbol{k}}\hat{e}^- = \sum_{q \geq 0} \gamma^q \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathfrak{I}^q_{[m,N]}} \sum_{n+p=q} \sum_{\substack{(\boldsymbol{i},\boldsymbol{j}) \in \mathrm{Dcmp}_{n,p}(\boldsymbol{k}) \\ i_n = k_q}} \hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}} I'_{\mathrm{nxt}_{j_1}(\boldsymbol{i})\,j_1} \cdots I'_{\mathrm{nxt}_{j_p}(\boldsymbol{i})\,j_p} \\ &= \sum_{n \geq 0} \gamma^n \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathfrak{I}^{n+p}_{[m,N]}} \sum_{p \geq 0} \sum_{\substack{(\boldsymbol{i},\boldsymbol{j}) \in \mathrm{Dcmp}_{n,p}(\boldsymbol{k}) \\ i_n = k_{n+p}}} \hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}} \Big(\gamma I'_{\mathrm{nxt}_{j_1}(\boldsymbol{i})\,j_1}\Big) \cdots \Big(\gamma I'_{\mathrm{nxt}_{j_p}(\boldsymbol{i})\,j_p}\Big), \end{aligned}$$

and we settle the lemma by combining the summation over $\boldsymbol{k}$ with the summation over $(\boldsymbol{i}, \boldsymbol{j})$, noting that $i_n = k_{n+p}$ is equivalent to $i_n > j_p$. ☐

Lemma B.4. *Let* $m = 1, \dots, N+1$, $n = 0, \dots, N$ *and* $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{I}^n_{[m,N]}$. *On* $s_N \cdots s_m \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+$ *we have*

$$\sum_{p \geq 0} \sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{j} \in \mathfrak{I}^p_{[m,i_n)} \\ \forall r,s\colon i_r \neq j_s}} \Big(\gamma I'_{\mathrm{nxt}_{j_1}(\boldsymbol{i})\,j_1}\Big) \cdots \Big(\gamma I'_{\mathrm{nxt}_{j_p}(\boldsymbol{i})\,j_p}\Big) = \prod_{k=1}^{l} \Big(1 + \gamma I'_{\sigma_k\,\tau_{k-1}+1}\Big) \cdots \Big(1 + \gamma I'_{\sigma_k\,\sigma_k-1}\Big),$$

with $(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_l)$ *and* $(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_l)$ *the initial and terminal entries of* $\boldsymbol{i}$*, respectively, and* $\tau_0 = m-1$*. If* $\sigma_1 = m$*, the* $(k = 1)$*-factor in the product over* k *equals* 1*, and all other factors involve at least* $1 + \gamma I'_{\sigma_k\,\tau_{k-1}+1}$*. Hence,*

$$P^{N+1}\hat{e}^- = \sum_{n\geq 0}\gamma^n \sum_{\boldsymbol{i}\in\mathfrak{I}^n_{[m,N]}} \hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}} \prod_{k=1}^{l}\Big(1+\gamma I'_{\sigma_k\,\tau_{k-1}+1}\Big)\cdots\Big(1+\gamma I'_{\sigma_k\,\sigma_k-1}\Big).$$

Proof. The idea is to place the different entries of $\boldsymbol{j}$ in different "bins" determined by the $l = l(\boldsymbol{i})$ consecutive runs in $\boldsymbol{i}$; this means in each bin the entry $\mathrm{nxt}_{j_p}(\boldsymbol{i})$ is the same, namely σ_k. This yields the first formula. By virtue of Lemma B.3 the expression for $P^{N+1}\hat{e}^-$ follows. ☐

Lemma B.5. *Let* $m = 1, \ldots, N+1$*,* $n = 0, \ldots, N$ *and* $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{I}^n_{[m,N]}$*. With the same notations as in Lemma B.4, on* $s_N \cdots s_m \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+$ *we have*

$$\hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}} = \hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}} \sum_{m_1=\tau_0+1}^{\sigma_1}\cdots\sum_{m_l=\tau_{l-1}+1}^{\sigma_l} \theta_{1\,\ldots\,m-1}\left(\prod_{k=1}^{l}\theta_{\tau_{k-1}\,\ldots\,m_k-1\,\sigma_k\,m_k\,\ldots\,\sigma_k-1\,\sigma_k+1\,\ldots\,\tau_k}\right)\theta_{\tau_l\,\ldots\,N}.$$

Proof. Due to the step operator $\theta_{N+1\,\boldsymbol{i}}$ incorporated in $\hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}}$ the function acted upon by $\hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}}$ vanishes in certain alcoves. By definition, $\hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}}$ introduces n integrations whose variables $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ replace the $x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_n}$ in the argument of the function acted on, and are bounded by $x_{i_{l-1}} > y_l > x_{i_l}$ for $l = 1, \ldots, n$. The intervals over which the y_l run can be split up into intervals bounded by neighbouring x_j. ☐

Lemma B.6. *Let* $m = 1, \ldots, N+1$*,* $n = 0, \ldots, N$ *and* $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{I}^n_{[m,N]}$*. With the same notations as in Lemma B.4, on* $s_N \cdots s_m \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+$ *we have*

$$\hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}}P^N = \hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}} \sum_{m_1=\tau_0+1}^{\sigma_1}\cdots\sum_{m_l=\tau_{l-1}+1}^{\sigma_l}\prod_{k=1}^{l}\theta_{\tau_{k-1}\,\ldots\,m_k-1\,\sigma_k\,m_k\,\ldots\,\sigma_{k-1}}(1+\gamma I_{\sigma_k\,m_k})\cdots(1+\gamma I_{\sigma_k\,\sigma_k-1}).$$

Proof. We remark that the product of θ-operators in Lemma B.5 defines precisely one alcove, given by the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 > \ldots > x_{m-1} &> \ldots > x_{m_1-1} > x_{\sigma_1} > x_{m_1} > \ldots > \widehat{x_{\sigma_1}} > \ldots > x_{\tau_1} > \\ &> \ldots > x_{m_2-1} > x_{\sigma_2} > x_{m_2} > \ldots > \widehat{x_{\sigma_2}} > \ldots > x_{\tau_2} > \\ &\quad\vdots \\ &> \ldots > x_{m_l-1} > x_{\sigma_l} > x_{m_l} > \ldots > \widehat{x_{\sigma_l}} > \ldots > x_{\tau_l} > \ldots > x_N, \end{aligned}$$

i.e. the alcove $\big(\prod_{k=1}^{l} s_{\sigma_k-1}\cdots s_{m_k}\big)\mathbb{R}^N_+$; the cycles $s_{\sigma_k-1}\cdots s_{m_k}$ are disjoint, since $\tau_{k-1} < m_k \leq \sigma_k$, so the order of the product over k is immaterial. Note that if $w_1, w_2 \in S_N$ are disjoint permutations (i.e. if for all $j = 1, \ldots, N$, $w_1(j) = j$ or $w_2(j) = j$) then $P^N|_{w_1 w_2\mathbb{R}^N_+} = (P^N|_{w_1\mathbb{R}^N_+})(P^N|_{w_2\mathbb{R}^N_+})$ which can be proven by induction on the lengths of w_1 and w_2. This results in

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}}P^N &= \hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}}\theta_{1\,\ldots\,m}\left(\prod_{k=1}^{l}\theta_{\tau_{k-1}\,\ldots\,m_k-1\,\sigma_k\,m_k\,\ldots\,\hat{\sigma}_k\,\ldots\,\tau_k}\right)\theta_{\tau_l\,\ldots\,N}P^N = \\ &= \hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}}\left(\prod_{k=1}^{l} s_{\sigma_k-1}\cdots s_{m_k}\right)\prod_{k=1}^{l} s_{m_k,\gamma}\cdots s_{\sigma_k-1,\gamma} \;=\; \hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}}\prod_{k=1}^{l} s_{\sigma_k-1}\cdots s_{m_k}s_{m_k,\gamma}\cdots s_{\sigma_k-1,\gamma}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields the lemma. ☐

Lemma B.7. *Let* $m = 1, \ldots, N+1$, $n = 0, \ldots, N$ *and* $\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{I}^n_{[m,N]}$. *With the same notations as in Lemma B.4, on* $s_N \cdots s_m \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+$ *we have*

$$\hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}} P^N = \hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}} \prod_{k=1}^{l} (1 + \gamma I'_{\sigma_k\, \tau_k+1}) \cdots (1 + \gamma I'_{\sigma_k\, \sigma_k-1})$$

and hence

$$b^- P^N = \sum_{n \geq 0} \gamma^n \sum_{\boldsymbol{i} \in \mathfrak{i}^n_{[m,N]}} \hat{e}^-_{\boldsymbol{i}} \prod_{k=1}^{l} (1 + \gamma I'_{\sigma_k\, \tau_k+1}) \cdots (1 + \gamma I'_{\sigma_k\, \sigma_k-1}).$$

Proof. By combining the step operators in Lemma B.6 for different values of $m_1, \ldots, m_l$. ☐

References

[1] R. J. Baxter. *Exactly solved models in statistical mechanics.* Academic Press Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers], London, 1989. Reprint of the 1982 original.

[2] D. Bernard, M. Gaudin, F. D. M. Haldane, and V. Pasquier. Yang-Baxter equation in long-range interacting systems. *J. Phys. A*, 26(20):5219–5236, 1993, hep-th/9301084.

[3] H. Bethe. Zur Theorie der Metalle. i. Eigenwerte und Eigenfunktionen der linearen Atomkette. *Zeitschrift für Physik A*, 71:205–226, 1931.

[4] I. Cherednik. A unification of Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov and Dunkl operators via affine Hecke algebras. *Invent. Math.*, 106(2):411–431, 1991.

[5] T. C. Dorlas. Orthogonality and completeness of the Bethe ansatz eigenstates of the nonlinear Schroedinger model. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 154(2):347–376, 1993.

[6] V. G. Drinfel′d. Degenerate affine Hecke algebras and Yangians. *Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen.*, 20(1):69–70, 1986.

[7] E. Emsiz. *Affine Weyl groups and integrable systems with delta-potentials.* PhD thesis, University of Amsterdam, Faculty of Science, 2006.

[8] E. Emsiz, E. M. Opdam, and J. V. Stokman. Periodic integrable systems with delta-potentials. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 264(1):191–225, 2006, math/0503034.

[9] L. Faddeev. Instructive history of the quantum inverse scattering method. *Acta Appl. Math.*, 39(1-3):69–84, 1995. KdV ’95 (Amsterdam, 1995).

[10] M. Gaudin. Bose gas in one dimension, I. The closure property of the scattering wavefunctions. *J. Math. Phys.*, 12:1674–1676, 1971.

[11] M. Gaudin. Bose gas in one dimension, II. orthogonality of the scattering states. *J. Math. Phys.*, 12:1677–1680, 1971.

[12] M. Gaudin. Boundary energy of a Bose gas in one dimension. *Phys. Rev. A*, 4(1):386–394, 1971.

[13] M. Gaudin. *La fonction d’onde de Bethe.* Collection du Commissariat à l’Énergie Atomique: Série Scientifique. [Collection of the Atomic Energy Commission: Science Series]. Masson, Paris, 1983.

[14] M. Girardeau. Relationship between systems of impenetrable bosons and fermions in one dimension. *J. Mathematical Phys.*, 1:516–523, 1960.

[15] E. Gutkin. Integrable systems with delta-potential. *Duke Math. J.*, 49(1):1–21, 1982.

[16] E. Gutkin. Conservation laws for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 2(1):67–74, 1985.

[17] E. Gutkin. Quantum nonlinear Schrödinger equation: two solutions. *Phys. Rep.*, 167(1-2):1–131, 1988.

[18] E. Gutkin and B. Sutherland. Completely integrable systems and groups generated by reflections. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 76(12):6057–6059, 1979.

[19] G. J. Heckman and E. M. Opdam. Yang's system of particles and Hecke algebras. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 145(1):139–173, 1997.

[20] K. Hikami. Boundary K-matrix, elliptic Dunkl operator and quantum many-body systems. *J. Phys. A*, 29(9):2135–2147, 1996.

[21] K. Hikami. Notes on the structure of the δ-function interacting gas. Intertwining operator in the degenerate affine Hecke algebra. *J. Phys. A*, 31(4):L85–L91, 1998.

[22] D. A. Kazhdan and G. Lusztig. Proof of the Deligne-Langlands conjecture for Hecke algebras. *Invent. Math.*, 87(1):153–215, 1987.

[23] Y. Komori and K. Hikami. Nonlinear Schrödinger model with boundary, integrability and scattering matrix based on the degenerate affine Hecke algebra. *Internat. J. Modern Phys. A*, 12(30):5397–5410, 1997.

[24] V. E. Korepin. Calculation of norms of Bethe wave functions. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 86(3):391–418, 1982.

[25] V. E. Korepin, N. M. Bogoliubov, and A. G. Izergin. *Quantum inverse scattering method and correlation functions.* Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.

[26] E. H. Lieb and W. Liniger. Exact analysis of an interacting Bose gas. I. The general solution and the ground state. *Phys. Rev. (2)*, 130:1605–1616, 1963.

[27] E. H. Lieb, R. Seiringer, and J. Yngvason. One-dimensional bosons in three-dimensional traps. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 91:150401, Oct 2003, cond-mat/0304071.

[28] G. Lusztig. Affine Hecke algebras and their graded version. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 2(3):599–635, 1989.

[29] I. G. Macdonald. *Affine Hecke algebras and orthogonal polynomials*, volume 157 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.

[30] S. Murakami and M. Wadati. Connection between Yangian symmetry and the quantum inverse scattering method. *J. Phys. A*, 29(24):7903–7915, 1996.

[31] S. Murakami and M. Wadati. Yangian Symmetry of the δ-Function Fermi Gas. *J. Phys. Soc. Jap.*, 65(5):1227–1232, 1996.

[32] E. M. Opdam. Harmonic analysis for certain representations of graded Hecke algebras. *Acta Math.*, 175(1):75–121, 1995.

[33] S. C. Oxford. *The Hamiltonian of the Quantized Nonlinear Schroedinger Equation.* PhD thesis, University of California, Los Angeles, 1979.

[34] A. P. Polychronakos. Exchange operator formalism for integrable systems of particles. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 69(5):703–705, 1992, hep-th/9202057.

[35] M. Reed and B. Simon. *Methods of modern mathematical physics. II. Fourier analysis, self-adjointness.* Academic Press, New York, 1975.

[36] R. Seiringer and J. Yin. The Lieb-Liniger model as a limit of dilute bosons in three dimensions. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 284(2):459–479, 2008, math-ph/0709.4022.

[37] E. K. Sklyanin. Quantum variant of the method of the inverse scattering problem. *J. Sov. Math.*, 19(5):1546–1596, 1982.

[38] E. K. Sklyanin. Boundary conditions for integrable quantum systems. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, 21:2375–2389, 1988.

[39] E. K. Sklyanin. New approach to the quantum nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *J. Phys. A*, 22(17):3551–3560, 1989.

[40] E. K. Sklyanin and L. D. Faddeev. Quantum-mechanical approach to completely integrable models of field theory. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 243:1430–1433, 1978.

[41] E. K. Sklyanin, L. A. Takhtajan, and L. D. Faddeev. Quantum inverse problem method. i. *Teoret. Mat. Fiz.*, 40(2):194–220, 1979.

[42] A. H. van Amerongen. *One-dimensional Bose gas on an atom chip.* PhD thesis, University of Amsterdam, 2008.

[43] A. H. van Amerongen, J. J. P. van Es, P. Wicke, K. V. Kheruntsyan, and N. J. van Druten. Yang-Yang thermodynamics on an atom chip. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 100(9):090402, 2008, cond-mat/0709.1899.

[44] B.H.M. Vlaar. *A non-symmetric Yang-Baxter algebra for the quantum nonlinear Schrdinger model.* PhD thesis, University of Glasgow, 2011.

[45] C. N. Yang. Some exact results for the many-body problem in one dimension with repulsive delta-function interaction. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 19(23):1312–1315, 1967.

[46] C. N. Yang and C. P. Yang. Thermodynamics of a one-dimensional system of bosons with repulsive delta-function interaction. *J. Mathematical Phys.*, 10:1115–1122, 1969.